

Thesis for Ph.D.

THE SOUTHERN PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE DOCTRINE OF THE
SPIRITUALITY OF THE CHURCH

Thos. H. Spence, Jr.

For The University of Edinburgh

1929



Degree conferred 28th June, 1929.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SCOPE OF THESIS	4
MANNER OF TREATMENT	5
BIBLIOGRAPHY	6
ABBREVIATIONS AND INDICATIONS	18
INTRODUCTION	20

Part One

THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY AND THE BIRTH OF THE CHURCH

Chapter

I. THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861	26
The variant ideas of State's Rights: In theory; Nullification and South Carolina; The crisis of 1860	
II. THE PHILADELPHIA ASSEMBLY AND THE GARDINER SPRING RESOLUTION	36
The organization of the Assembly: J. C. Backus Moderator-- The Gardiner Spring Resolution: Adoption after prolonged discussion; The Resolution analyzed; The Hodge Protest and Answer--The Backus Resolution--Similar acts of New- school Assembly--Growth of the Political spirit in Assem- bly--Summary	
III. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFED- ERATE STATES OF AMERICA	69
Political events, June to December 1861--The Atlanta Con- vention--The Augusta Assembly--"Address to all the Church- es of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth" Analysis; Appre- ciation--Freedom of Assembly from political discussion-- Summary	

Part Two

THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE TEACHINGS OF THE CHURCH

IV. THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE CHURCH	89
I. The nature of the Church, Origin; 2 Ends; 3 Means of ad- vancement--II. Separation of Church and State: Church not to meddle in political affairs; State not to in- terfere in purely ecclesiastical matters--III. Proper relation of Church and State: Church to respect laws relative to property-holding, etc.; The churchman and the civil government (The right of Revolution); "God rather than men"--IV. Liberty of Conscience and Relig- ious Worship--Summary	

Part Three

THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

Chapter

V. SPIRITUALITY IN CHURCH UNION AND ECCLESIASTICAL AFFILIATION 145

Union with The United Synod of the South, The Presbytery of Patapsco, Alabama Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church, The Synod of Kentucky, and The Synod of Missouri--Relations and Negotiations with the U. S. A. Church--With the United Presbyterian Church--The Federal Council of Churches--Fraternal correspondence--Summary

VI. A LIVING CREED 183

The principle of Spirituality illustrated in the CHURCH'S actions regarding: (1), War and Peace; (2), The Sabbath; (3), Temperance and Prohibition; (4), Miscellaneous civil laws and issues; (5), Secular affairs; (6), Governmental establishment of Religion--Spirituality attested by the Church--Zeal in propagating the doctrine--Act of The Assemblies of 1875 and 1876--Summary

VII. THE DISCORD OF CREED AND CONDUCT 221

Definite violations of the principle of Spirituality--Probable violations--Apparent deviations from principle--Transgressions of lower courts of the Church--Individuals and Spirituality--Summary

CONCLUSIONS 254

APPENDIX:

A. "Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth"	266
B. The Gardiner Spring Resolution	272
C. Report of Special Committee on Resolution--1861	273
D. Hodge Protest to the Gardiner Spring Resolution	273
E. Answer to the Hodge Protest	276

SCOPE

In this thesis it is not proposed to:

- 1 Discuss the general relations of Church and State;
- 2 Investigate the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church (See Introduction for definition) as held by the Presbyterian Church at large;
- 3 Consider the Doctrine and workings of the principle of Spirituality in the Congregations, Presbyteries, and Synods of what was to be the Southern Presbyterian Church prior to its organization as a separate body in 1861;
- 4 Attempt a study of the acts of the various inferior courts of the Church concerning the subject under investigation.

It is proposed to:

- 1 Make a thorough study of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church as held by the Southern Presbyterian Church in all its relations to that Church and its activities, under the following heads: 1, Birth (Organization of the Church and the causes leading thereto); 2, Teachings (Official and semi-official statements of the Doctrine of Spirituality; 3, Life (The manner in which the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church has influenced the acts and activities of the Church);
- 2 Exhaustively digest the work of the General Assembly of the Church, and bring to bear upon the theme all relevant material thus obtained;
- 3 Indicate points of likeness or dissimilarity between the position assumed or action taken by the Southern Presbyterian Church and other Churches, especially those of the Presbyterian family, when such procedure illumines the matter under consideration.

SPECIFIC TREATMENT OF SUBJECT

At to the details and order of treatment, it is planned to:

- 1 Sketch the necessary political background of the Philadelphia Assembly of 1861;
 - 2 Show the manner in which this Assembly was led to make a far-reaching political pronouncement;
 - 3 Describe the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, with emphasis on "The Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth;"
 - 4 Analyze the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church as taught by the Southern Presbyterian Church;
 - 5 Indicate the importance attached to this principle in ecclesiastical union and fraternal relations;
 - 6 Demonstrate the manner in which the Church has regulated her official acts in accord with this doctrine;
 - 7 Note those instances in which the General Assembly has violated the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church;
- Summarize the conclusions drawn from the study as a whole

The numbers above correspond with those of the chapters in the body of the thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(A list of the works consulted in the preparation of this thesis)

This bibliography has been divided into two parts:

A. Specific literature on the Southern Presbyterian Church

B. General literature on the question of Spirituality

A.

1. "The Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America." 1861-1864

(Indicated in the text by the letters AM. A reference to the Assembly's Minutes of 1862, page 26, would appear thus:
AM-1862-26)

2. "The Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States." 1865-1928

(Indicated in the text in the same manner as above. The year will serve to distinguish between the two)

3. Published Summaries of the Acts of the General Assembly:

1. "A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States from its Organization to the Assembly of 1887." W. A. Alexander. Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Richmond. 1888. (Abbreviated "Alexander's Digest 1887")

2. "Supplement to the Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," bringing the same down to date." W. A. Alexander. Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Richmond. 1898. (Abbreviated "Alexander's Digest 1897")

3. "A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Revised down to and including the Acts of the General Assembly of 1910." W. A. Alexander and G. F. Nicolassen. Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Richmond. 1911 (Abbreviated "Alexander's Digest 1910")
4. "A Digest of the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, Revised down to and including the Acts of the General Assembly of 1922." G. F. Nicolassen. Presbyterian Committee of Publication. Richmond. 1923. (Not abbreviated)

Adger, J. B.--"Bannerman's 'Church of Christ' "--Art. in "Southern Presbyterian Review (Hereinafter designated by SPR)"--Vol. 20, Page 520

--"Northern and Southern Views of the Province of the Church"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 16, Page 384

--"Thornwell's Memorial on the Recognition of Christianity in the Constitution"--Art in SPR--Vol. 16, Page 77

Anonymous--"Baltimore Conference"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 26, Page 283

--"Review of Thompson's 'History of the Presbyterian Churches' "Presbyterian Quarterly"--Vol. 9, Page 618

Beattie, F. R.--"The Presbyterian Standards"--Presbyterian Committee of Publication (Abbreviated PCP)--Richmond--1896

Boggs, W. E.--"Church and State in their Reciprocal Relations
and Fundamental Contrasts"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 35, Page 137

"BTW"--"The Church and Politics"--Art. in SPR--Sept-Oct. 1867

Cannon, F. F.--Art. in "Union Seminary Review", April, 1916, on
union of Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches

Cecil, Russell--"Handbook of Theology"--PCP-1923

"Christian Observer"--Louisville, Ky.--Weekly religious newspaper

Clark, W. C.--"Church and State"--Art. in "Presbyterian Quarterly"--
Jan. 1900

Craig, D. I.--"Development of the Presbyterian Church in North
Carolina"--

Dabney, R. L.--"Lectures on Sacred Rhetoric"--PCP

--"Theology"--PCP-(Page references to 2nd edition)

Foote, William Henry--"Sketches of North Carolina"--Robert Carter--
New York--1846

Gordon, E. C.--"Christ or Caesar"--Art. in "Union Seminary Magazine"--
Oct.-Nov., 1911

Grastyy J. S.--"Life of Rev. Samuel Brown McPheeters"--South-
west Book and Publishing Co.--St. Louis--1871

Hoge, P. H.--"Moses Drury Hoge"--PCP

"Homiletic Review"--"The Church and the Voter"--July, 1924

Johnson, Thomas Carey--"Life and Letters of Rev. Benjamin Morgan
Palmer, D. D., LL.D. D."--PCP

--"Life and Letters of Rev. R. L. Dabney, D. D., LL.D. D."--
PCP

--"American Church History Series"--"The Southern Presbyterian
Church"

--"Virginia Presbyterianism and Religious Liberty"--PCP--1907

Jones, Dudley--"Presbyterian Church in South Carolina"

Kerr, R. P.--"People's History of Presbyterianism"--PCP--1888

Lingle, W. L.--"Presbyterians--Their History and Beliefs"--PCP--
1928

--"Tolerance and Intolerance"--"Presbyterian of the South"2/29/28

--"The General Assembly, 1925"--Art. in "Union Seminary Review"--
July, 1928

--"The Lexington Assembly"--Art. in "Union Seminary Review"--
July, 1925

Lyon, J. A.--"Religion and Politics"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 15, Page
569

Miller, A. W.--"Christ and the State"--Art. in SPR--Apr., 1870

Minter, W. R.--Art. in "Union Seminary Review"--Jan., 1918-- On
Proposed union with Northern Presbyterian Church

"Minutes Rocky River Congregation--1835"

Moore, W. W.--"George L. Christian"--Art. in "Union Seminary Review"--Oct., 1924

McGeachy, D. P.--"Peace Propaganda not Political"--Art. in "Christian Observer"--

McIlwaine, H. R.--"The Struggle of Protestant Dissenters for Religious Toleration in Virginia"--Pamphlet--Johns Hopkins Press--1894

McIlwaine, Richard--"Memoirs of Three Score Years and Ten"--Neale--New York--1908

McLaughlin, Henry W.--"The New Call"--PCP--1926

Nourse, W. L.--"The Civil Sabbath"--Art. in "Presbyterian Quarterly"--Jan., 1897, Page 39

Palmer, B. M.--"Life and Letters of James Henley Thornwell, D. D., LL. D."--Whittet and Shepperson--Richmond
--"The Church a Spiritual Kingdom"--In "Memorial Addresses before the Assembly at Quarter-Centennial"

Peck, T. E.--"Church and State"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 15, Page 121
--"Miscellaneous of Rev. Thos. E. Peck, D. D. LL. D."

"Presbyterian of the South"--Richmond, Va--Weekly religious newspaper.

"Presbyterian Standard"--Charlotte, N. C.--Weekly religious newspaper.

- Reed, R. C.--"History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World"--
Westminster Press--Philadelphia--1905
- "The Presbyterian Church in the United States"--In "The
Churches of the Federal Council"--Fleming H. Revell Company--
Ed. by C. S. Macfarland--1916
- Robinson, Stuart--"The Church of God"--Joseph M. Wilson--Phil-
adelphia--1858
- Senate Document No. 281, 58th Congress, 2nd Session--"A Memorial
concerning Conditions in the Independent State of the Kongo"
- Smyth, Thomas--"Ecclesiastical Catechism"--In Vol. II, Pages
485ff of "Smyth's Works"
- Thornwell, J. H.--"Exposition and Vindication of the Revised
Book of Discipline"--Pamphlet--Shepperson and Co., Agents--
Richmond--1872
- Vinson, T. C.--"William McCutchan Morrison"--PCP--1921
- Waddell, J. A.--"Political Religion"--Art. in SPR--Vol. 34,--Page
"The Church and its Relation to Civil Government"--Art. in
SPR--Vol. 20, Page 25
- Webb, R. A.--"Christian Salvation, Its Doctrine and Experience"--
PCP--1921
- Whaling, Thornton--"The Making of Woodrow Wilson"--Art. in "Union
Seminary Review"--Oct. 1925--Page 38
- White, H. A.--"Southern Presbyterian Leaders"--Neale--New York--
1911

B.

1. "The Minutes of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia?" 1775
 2. "The Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."
(Indicated in the text by the letters AMUSA. The year and page are shown as in the case of the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America)
 3. Published Summaries of the Acts of the U. S. A. Assembly:
 1. "Acts of the Presbyterian Church?" S. J. Baird. 2nd ed.
 2. "Digest of Acts and Deliverances of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." Vol. II. 1923
 4. "The Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (New-school)."
1861, 1862
-

Anonymous--"What has the Church of Scotland done for Scotland?"

Associated Press--Dispatched printed in "Johnson City Chronicle"--
Feb. 6, 1929

Balfour, R. Gordon--"Presbyterianism in the Colonies"--Macniven
& Wallace--Edinburgh--1899

Bannerman, D. D.--"The Scripture Doctrine of the Church"--T. &
T. Clark--Edinburgh--1887

Barr, James--"The Scottish Church Question"--James Clark & Co.,
Ltd.--London--1920

Buchanan, Robert--"Ten Year's Conflict"--Blackie & Son--Glasgow,
Edinburgh, London--1861

Calvin, John--"Institutes of Christianity"--Sixth American Edition--
Presbyterian Board of Publication--Philadelphia

Calvin Memorial Addresses--PCP--1909

Chambers, Henry E.--"A Higher History of The United States"--
Revised Edition--American Book Company

"Christaen Century"--Weekly religious publication--Chicago

Clark, W. L.--"Elementary Law"--The American Law Book Company--
New York--1909

Cobb--"Rise of Religious Liberty in America"--Macmillan--1902

"Constitution of the United States of America"

Cunningham--"Discourses on Church Principles"

Cunningham, Wm.--"The Independence of the Church"--Pamphlet--
Edinburgh--1839

D'Aubigne, J. H. M.--"History of the Reformation of the 16th
Century"--Volume 4--American Tract Society--New York--1847

"The Declaration of Independence"--July 4, 1776

Dick, John--"Lectures on Theology"--Robert Carter and Brothers--
New York--1864

Duke of Argyll--"Disestablishment"--Pamphlet--Reprint from "Con-
temporary Review"--Strahan & Company--London--1878

Fleming, J. R.--"The Burning Bush"--T. & T. Clark--Edinburgh--1917

Flint, Robert--"The Church Question in Scotland"--William Blackwood & Sons--Edinburgh and London--1891

--"The Duty of the People of Scotland to the Church of Scotland"--William Blackwood & Son--Edinburgh and London--1882

Gillespie, Thomas--"Aaron's Red Blossoming"--London--1646

Henry, W. W.--"The Westminster Assembly"--Pamphlet--Whittet & Shepperson--Richmond--1897

Hill, George--"Lectures in Divinity"--Robert Carter and Brothers--New York--1867

Hodge, A. A.--"Commentary on the Confession of Faith"--Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath School Work--Philadelphia--1920

Hodge, Chas.--"Church Polity"

--"Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America"

Hunter, A. Mitchell--"The Teaching of Calvin--A Modern Interpretation"--Maclehose, Jackson and Co.--Glasgow--1920

Innes, A. Taylor--"Church and State"--T. & T. Clark--Edinburgh

Jenkins, John S.--"John Caldwell Calhoun"--Hurst & Co.--New York

Lindsay--"Luther and the German Reformation"

Macartney, C. E.--"The Presbyterian Church and the Nation"--

Art. in "Union Seminary Review"--July 1926--Page 330

Macewan, A. R.--"Life and Letters of John Cairns, D. D. LL. D."

Macfarland, C. S.--"The Permanent Contributions of Geneva and

John Calvin to Church and State in America"--Art. in

"Union Seminary Review"--Jan. 1926

Mackenzie, William--"Present Duty of the Church of Scotland to

Her Sole King and Head"--Pamphlet--John Hohnstone--Edin-

burgh--1829

Macpherson, Hector--"Scotland's Battles for Spiritual Independence"

Mosheim, J. L. Von--"Institutes of Ecclesiastical History: Ancient and Modern"--Vol. III--Robert Carter & Brothers--New York--1869

Moule, H. C. G.--"Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges"--
"The Epistle to the Romans"--Cambridge University Press--
1884

Munford, Beverly B.--"Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession"--L. H. Jenkins--Richmond--New Edition

Morris, Edward D.--"Ecclesiology--A Treatise on the Church and Kingdom of God on Earth"--Chas. Scribner's Sons--New York--
1890

McCrie, C. G.--"The Church of Scotland, Her Divisions and Unions"--

Macniven & Wallace--Edinburgh--1901

"News-Leader"--Richmond Daily

"New York Times"

Reformed Presbytery--"Act, Declaration and Testimony"--4th Edition
with some Additions"--1797

Roberts, Wm. Henry--"A Manual for Ruling Elders"--Presbyterian
Board of Pub. and S. S. Work--Philadelphia--1917

--"Concise History of the Presbyterian Church"--Presby-
terian Board of Pub. and S. S. Work--Philadelphia--1922

--"Laws Relating to Religious Corporations"--Presbyterian
Board of Pub. and S. S. Work--Philadelphia--1908

Rutherford, Samuel (under initials "F. A.")--"Lex, Rex"--First
Edition--London--1644

Schaff, Philip--"History of the Apostolic Church"--Charles Scrib-
ner & Co.--New York--1870

"Scotsman"

Scott, Archibald--"Is the National Church Worth Preserving?"--
Pamphlet--David Douglas--Edinburgh--1882

Simpson, P. C.--"Life of Principal Rainy"--Hodder & Stoughton--
London, New York, Toronto

Spring, Gardiner--"Glory of Christ"--Vol. I--M. W. Dodd--New
York--1852

Stanton, V. H.--"Theocracy"--Art. in HDB

Stephenson, N. W.--"An American History"

Story, R. H.--"The Continuancy of the Church of Scotland"--

James Maclehose & Son--Glasgow--1882

"Times-Dispatch"--Richmond Daily

Thompson, R. E.--"Presbyterians" in American Church History Series

Tucker, Beverly D., Jr.--"Christian Citizenship"--Art. in "Union

Seminary Review"--Jan. 1928--Page 125

U. F. Church of Scotland--No. XXXII--"Revision of the Confession"

Van Dyke, Henry J.--"The Church, Her Ministry and Sacraments"--

Anson D. F. Randolph & Co.--New York--1890

Witherow, Thomas--"The Form of the Christian Temple"--Edinburgh--

1889

"World Almanac and Encyclopedia"--Press Publishing Company--New

York--1922

Walker, Williston--"History of the Christian Church"--Charles

Scribner's Sons--New York--1920

Wylie, D. G.--"Plan, Purpose, and Programme of the Lord's Day

Alliance of the United States"--Pamphlet

ABBREVIATIONS AND INDICATIONS

(Other than those covered in the Bibliography)

1 The following titles are employed synonymously:

1 "The Presbyterian Church in the United States"

2 "The Southern Presbyterian Church"

3 "The Southern Church"

4 "CHURCH" (The use of such capitals denotes an institution of the Southern Presbyterian Church; as GENERAL ASSEMBLY, etc. Such designation is resorted to only where there would otherwise be a likelihood of confusion or ambiguity)

2 Likewise:

1 "The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America"

2 "The Northern Presbyterian Church"

3 "The Northern Church"

4 "The USA Church"

3 Since two branches of the Presbyterian Church in the country, between the years 1837 and 1870, claimed the name, "The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America," distinction is secured by the popular designations, "Old-school" and "New-school." Unless otherwise stated, the Old-school body is intended.

4 A date inclosed in parentheses, following the name of an individual, denotes that such a person was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church in that year. Thus: "Stuart Robinson (1869)."

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the earthly history of the Christian Church there has ever been a difficulty in drawing that mystic line which separates the human, standing for the things of this world, from the Divine, which represents the sphere of the Eternal. Before the Canon of Scripture had been closed, a tendency to such confusion was manifest; and so it is little wonder that, in these latter days, a right relation between the Empire of Caesar and the Kingdom of God is frequently obscured.

The errors of this sort are so often, not the results of premeditated evil, but rather the children of a misconception of the nature and province of the Church of the Living God. But truth, in this connection, though crushed to earth, has always risen again; and even when the true doctrine of the Church appears to have fallen into obscurity, there have been raised up spirits who could not rest until just notions of the relations of the Church and the State had been regained. Today we approach this subject with the heritage of the centuries as our possession; and surrounded by that great cloud of witnesses, who, in every age, have contended for the due rights of the organized People of God.

It is altogether necessary, in the beginning of our study, that we take care to define the terms to be employed in the discussion which is to follow. The title, "The Southern Presbyterian Church and the Spirituality of the Church," is composed of two expressions worthy of notice in this connection--The Southern Presbyterian Church and The Spirituality of the Church.

The former is the popular name for that ecclesiastical body which was organized in 1861, under the title, "The Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America." With the downfall of the Confederacy in 1865, the name was changed to "The Presbyterian Church in the United States;" and such is the formal designation today of that communion which is the subject of our sketch.

"The Spirituality of the Church" is not used in the sense in which the same expression is sometimes employed by other denominations--namely, as relating to the purity of the Church. "Spirituality" is rather intended to convey a notion of the nature and mission of the Church as relating to the things of Christ and His Kingdom as contrasted with the things of the world and its government. Such use of the word is not a modern one; for in 1646 we find Thomas Millespie writing ("Aaron's Rod Blossoming"--246):

" . . . The Scripture holdeth forth the Civil and Ecclesiastical power as most distinct, insomuch that it condemneth the Spiritualizing of the Civil Power, as well as the Secularizing of the Ecclesiastical Power; State Papacy, as well as Papal-State."

A leader of the CHURCH in the ante-bellum South has thrown light upon this significance as attached to the term. Dr. Thomas Smyth, in his "Ecclesiastical Catechism," ("Smyth's Works"--Vol. IV--485) teaches, in the form of question and answer:

"How else may you describe this power of the Church ?

"It is Spiritual, and addressed to the consciences of those who are subject to it, in contrast to the Jewish Polity, which was external, carnal, and typical."

"In what respects is this Power, or government of the Church, Spiritual ?

"Its objects are Spiritual: namely, the souls and consciences of men. Its end is Spiritual: namely, the glory of God, in ^{the} instruction, guidance, and salvation of men. Its law is Spiritual: namely, the word of Christ, in its institutions, commands, prohibitions, and promises. Its acts and exercises are Spiritual: namely, the admission, exclusion, or discipline, of its members. And its sanctions are Spiritual: namely, the withdrawment of Spiritual privileges, and the threatening of future and everlasting retribution, at the hand of the Judge."

When we come to the field of what might be termed "Applied Spirituality," it will be discovered that "Spirituality" will almost always be found standing in contrast to what we may term the "Political;" in other words, it is largely a question of the Church as it stands in relation to civil affairs. With only several exceptions, it is in this sense that the expression is employed in the study represented by this paper. Dr. W. L. Lingle, Moderator of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY of 1920, notes the distinctive characteristics of his communion ("Presbyterians"-163):

"1. A firm conviction that the mission of the church is entirely spiritual, and in no sense political..... We believe in the absolute separation of church and state. This does not keep the church from dealing

with great moral and ethical questions, but it should deal with them from a spiritual and not a political point of view."

We may sum up the idea of the Spirituality of the Church by saying that the nature of the Church is Spiritual, the mission of the Church is Spiritual, and the methods by which the Church is to do its work are Spiritual. By nature it is "not of this world;" its mission is to "make disciples;" its methods are those of a people who, "though they walk in the flesh," do not war after the flesh.

The word "Political" is not employed to designate those things pertaining to the distinct parties in American politics, nor does it have reference to any partisan measures whatever; but rather to the affairs of the State as contrasted with those of the Church. For all practical purposes it may be regarded as synonymous with "civil."

There remains but one additional topic for notice in these introductory pages--a comparison of the situation in America with that in Scotland as regards the doctrine which forms the subject of this thesis. In compliance with the principle of Spirituality, we may say that in America the Church must not wholly or in part usurp the functions of the Civil Government; while in Scotland the same doctrine forbids that the State undertake to control the ecclesiastical affairs of the Church. In both countries the question involved is the Headship of Christ over the Church. In his sermon at the opening of the First General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church, we find Dr. B. M. Palmer (1861) preaching upon this very subject. So in the

"Claim of Right" the Headship of Christ is declared to be the fundamental principle involved in the battle for Spiritual freedom (Macpherson--"Scotland's Battles for Spiritual Independence"--226). Different conditions resulted in diverse struggles in the two lands, but the abiding principle was, and is, the same on both sides of the Atlantic.

In the entire treatment of this subject, especially in the presentation of facts connected with the actions of the General Assembly of the Old-school Presbyterian Church to which Presbyterians of the South took exception, an effort will be made to abstain from all that is bitter or sarcastic. While this entire work is undisguisedly a presentation of the Southern viewpoint, the author does not believe that it is either necessary or desirable to support such positions as are taken by bitter invective or rampant denunciation. The sober facts have always shown more power to convince the unprejudiced reader, than the endless amount of disputation in which they are so frequently enshrouded as to render an appraisal of the case on its merits impossible. The strongest possible apology for the Southern Presbyterian Church is to be found in the simple recital of the history of those days which called it into being, together with a record of its works from that time to the present hour.

And thus we turn this page, to be carried back into the years of yesterday.

THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY AND

THE BIRTH OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER ONE

THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF 1861

The road of approach to the consideration of Spirituality is a negative one. For this reason it is necessary to begin the treatment of our subject with a discussion of affairs political; since an understanding of the political situation is essential to an interpretation of the events which took place in the American Presbyterian Church in the year 1861.

The two variant ideas of that aspect of the Federal Government which has been denominated "State's Rights" lay at the heart of the controversy which agitated the nation at that time. First, let us turn our attention to the theory of the question; later, we shall see how that theory effected the life of the nation. W. L. Clark ("Elementary Law"-22) writes:

"It is a fundamental theory in the United States that sovereignty is in the people; that all governmental powers reside primarily in the whole body of United States citizens. This sovereign body, however, exercises its power only through its agents or officers.Sovereignty is not delegated to them. That always remains with the people. That which is delegated is the immediate power of exercising certain governmental functions. These officers represent the sovereign body; they do not become sovereign themselves."

Again, on page 24, he continues:

"The state governments have inherent in themselves all power, except so far as they are limited by their own

or the federal constitution.....A state constitution differs radically in its character from the federal constitution. We have seen that the federal constitution is chiefly made up of a grant of powers to the federal government, and that the federal government is limited to the powers given it, either expressly or by implication, by that instrument. In other words, the federal government has no powers whatever except such as are given it by the federal constitution. The state governments have inherent in themselves, however, all power, except so far as they are limited by either the federal constitution or their own."

The question which came to a head in those stormy days of the sixties was that of loyalty to government. The view of the South, rightly or wrongly, was that the allegiance of the citizen was primarily due to the government of that individual State in which he resided. The inhabitant of Virginia would place loyalty to the dominion above loyalty to the Federal Government at Washington. While we have neither the space nor the license to dwell upon the merits of the question involved, it must be remembered that such an interpretation of government was no novel one; but rather had been championed, by all at times, by many always, since the birth of the country (Chambers--"Higher History of the United States"-371). The same author contrasts the two viewpoints quite fairly:

"The North had received a great many immigrants from Europe since the Revolution. These people came to the

'United States,' and in their minds were citizens of the United States more than they were citizens of any particular state. To them and to their descendants, loyalty meant allegiance and fidelity to the Government of the United States, or the 'Union.'

"The Southern States had received very few of these immigrants. The white people of the South were the same in blood, thought, and feeling as they were at the time of the Revolution. They held to the ideas that at one time all Americans had believed in, which were, that the State, and not the Federal Government, was the sovereign authority, and that a State had the right to secede from the Union. The people of the South were therefore loyal to their State governments." ("Higher History of the United States"-371)

Dr. Walter W. Moore, Moderator of the General Assembly of 1908, President of the CHURCH'S greatest theological school until two months before his death, prince of preachers, and master of ecclesiastical statesmanship, presented the Southern cause in an address, on October 5th, 1924. In regard to the reason for the secession of the States, he said:

"The Southern States withdrew from the Union in order to save the Constitution and to solve in an honest and peaceable way the difficult economic problem which had been thrust upon them by the mother country. Their desire was to get rid of the institution of slavery by gradual emancipation, so as to avoid the frightful con-

sequences which were sure to follow from sudden and violent emancipation, as two generations of our people have seen with their own eyes." ("Union Seminary Review"-Oct., 1924-12)

A very obtrusive phase of the question of State's Rights was the so-called Nullification Controversy. Nullification was simply a State's power to veto a measure passed by the legislative authorities of the Federal Government, when that State considered that Congress had assumed powers not delegated to it by the Constitution (Chambers-326).

The Embargo Act, passed by Congress in 1807, proved to work to the detriment of the manufacturers of New England. Massachusetts, through her legislature, condemned the law; while the Governor of Connecticut declined to enforce its provisions.

But the great champion of the Nullification Idea was the South Carolinian, John C. Calhoun. In a letter to Governor Hamilton, of his own State, written from Fort Hill, S. C., on August 28th, 1832, he explained:

"The General Government has the right, in the first instance, of construing its own powers, which, if final and conclusive, as is supposed by many, would have placed the reserved powers at the mercy of the delegated, and thus destroyed the equilibrium of the system. Against that, a state has the right of nullification." (Rives-"Life of John C. Calhoun"-219)

The situation at the time the foregoing words were written had become acute. A protective tariff had been passed by Congress which worked to the hurt of the agricultural South. South

Carolina at once prepared to resist the enforcement of the provisions of the law within the State. Forcible combatment of the execution of the measure was planned. At this point, Henry Clay succeeded in securing the passage of a program, in the nature of a compromise, through Congress, which was accepted by each of the contending parties. This new law worked toward a gradual reduction of duties on imports. Thus peace was secured and principle preserved.

The year 1860, however, marked the great crisis in the contention. The discussion of the question of slavery continued in an acutely increasing manner. Compromises and plans were thrown aside; while the Presidential election of 1860 brought the matter to a focus. The Democratic Convention, held in Charleston, S. C., was marked by the withdrawal of the delegates from seven states. The termination of the matter was the division of the party into two wings, a Northern and a Southern. The former presented one candidate for president, while the South put forward another. Abraham Lincoln was the nominee of the Republican Party, and was elected chief executive.

Under the belief that the Republicans would undoubtedly undertake a policy of general emancipation of slaves, a convention of the citizens of South Carolina, authorized by the Legislature, and composed of delegates elected by the people of that State in regular order, voted to secede from the Union. (For particulars concerning this phase of the situation see A. H. Stephens-"The War between the States"-Vol. II) This action was taken on December 20th, 1860. By the time set for the meeting of the General

Assembly of the following year Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Texas, Virginia, and Arkansas had followed the turbulent little commonwealth in severing connection with the Central Government. The Assembly was still in session when North Carolina was added to the list; and Tennessee withdrew on the eight of June.

It is necessary to pause here, in our rapid sketch, to note the reason for the secession of several of these States, especially that of Virginia. Upon the move of South Carolina, a demand was made by the authorities of that State that Fort Sumter, in Charleston Harbor, be turned over to local military forces. The Federal commanding officer refused to comply with the order, and preparations were made to take the position by force. Meanwhile Seward, Lincoln's Secretary of State, gave promise that no effort would be made to send aid to its garrison and that the fort would be abandoned to the Southerners. In direct violation of this promise the Federal authorities of Washington dispatched troops to the aid of the besieged. Efforts to explain this duplicity have not proved convincing. The excuse rendered was that Seward had no authority to make such a promise. When the troops attacking the stronghold were notified by Washington that reinforcements were being dispatched, they at once opened fire, and soon reduced the defenders into submission.

President Lincoln at once called for 75,000 troops for the suppression of the revolt (so-called). It was at this juncture that Virginia, Arkansas, North Carolina and Tennessee left the Union. The people of Virginia had been loath to forsake the Re-

public. The shades of the fathers of old still hovered over her halls of assemblage and inspired her people. Washington, Henry, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Randolph were Virginians as well as Americans. Leaving the Union because of the election of Lincoln was one thing; furnishing troops for the crushing of her brothers was another. The general, and in respect to the problem of slavery specific, explanation of the course of the Old Dominion of Dr. Moore has already been noted. A present-day writer discusses the matter in such a way as to give an excellent idea of the motives prompting the State to secede:

"It will suffice to say that whether regarded as a constitutional or a revolutionary right, or both combined, the people of Virginia held that the Cotton States, having deliberately and with almost unexampled unanimity, decided to dissolve the political relations which had formerly existed between them and their sister commonwealths, there was with respect to the legal and ethical character of this action no competent court of review this side of the judgment seat of Heaven. The wisdom of their secession might be denied, the morality of their action might be questioned, the disastrous consequences to the Union might be admitted, but still no right existed in any body of men to invade their country and defeat their aspirations by the sword.

Had not a people as numerous and united as those of the Cotton States the inherent right, in the language of the Declaration of Independence, 'To assume among

the powers of the earth the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and Nature's God entitled them ? ' Were the just powers of government derived from the consent of the governed ? To the Virginians of 1861 it was a solecism to accord to one body of people a right, and yet acknowledge in another the equal right to defeat its exercise. It was an anachronism to talk in America, after the Declaration of Independence and the war with Great Britain, about the right of self-government in three millions of people as being dependent upon force. This was acknowledged before Samuel Adams and Thomas Jefferson were born, and before the Patriots had made good their great avowals by their heroic struggles from Concord to 'orktown. ' Force Virginia insisted, was not the method of holding great masses of American Freemen in unwilling association with their follows; nor the implements of war, the legitimate means of determining great questions of legal and ethical right. (Beverly Munford-"Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession"-291ff)

Again we turn to the words of Dr. Moore ("Union Seminary

Review"-October-1924-22ff):

"Few misrepresentations have been more industriously and successfully fostered than the libel that the South was fighting for the perpetuation of slavery. As to Virginia, the charge is little short of infamous in view of the record of the State in endeavoring to prevent the establishment of the slave trade, her efforts being defeated by other States, among them three

of the New England States, as well as four of the Southern States. Hear these words of General Lee written in December, 1856: 'In this enlightened age there are few, I believe, but will acknowledge that as an institution slavery is a moral and political evil in any country. It is useless to expatiate on its disadvantages. I think it, however, a greater evil to the white than to the black race, and while my feelings are strongly enlisted in behalf of the latter, my sympathies are strongly for the former. While we say that the course of the final abolishment of slavery is onward and we give it the aid of our prayers and all justifiable means in our power, we must leave the progress as well as the result in His hands who sees the end and chooses to work by slow influences' ('Life' by Fitzhugh Lee)."

(It is interesting to note that Dr. Thornwell had the same idea as to the necessity for the abolishment of the institution of slavery. In his "Life of W. H. Thornwell," Dr. Palmer tells of how this conclusion was reached during a visit to Europe, in 1861. In the words of the author:

"Whilst in Europe he made up his mind to move, immediately upon his return, for the gradual emancipation of the negro, as the only measure that would give peace to the country." (Page 482))

Thus we stand at the opening of the General Assembly which met in Philadelphia, in the year 1861. Nine States have left the

Union, and the Federal Government is endeavoring to forcibly compel them to reenter. These States have a population of more than seven million people. Two ideas as to the rights of the individual State have clashed. The people of the South believe that loyalty to State is to come before allegiance to the Nation. The States which have seceded number among their inhabitants tens of thousands of Presbyterians. The Assembly convenes.

It must be remembered that the Constitution of the United States was not only openly denounced by Abolition leaders in the North, but that fourteen of the Northern States passed so-called Personal Liberty bills, which, to quote the words of Henry E. Chambers, "nullified the laws of Congress for the recovery of the fugitive slaves." ("Higher History of the United States"-362) It was on the basis of this and kindred actions that the Cotton States claimed that the Union from which they withdrew was not that created by the Constitution.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PHILADELPHIA ASSEMBLY AND THE GARDINER SPRING RESOLUTION

Only nine representatives were enrolled from those States which had gone out from the Union. The election of the Moderator resulted in the choice of The Reverend John C. Backus, D. D., of Baltimore. (The printed Minutes of the Assembly err in this respect. The record reads: "John T. Backus, of Baltimore." It is interesting to note that there was a minister by ^{what well may have been} that name in the Assembly, Rev. J. T. Backus, D. D., of the Presbytery of Albany. The narrative of the meeting is signed, "John C. Backus.") This selection is, in itself, noteworthy and indicative. Rev. W. L. Lingle, D. D., former Professor of Church History in Union Seminary (Va.), has said that Backus was elected by a "stay-clear-of-war" party.

The region from which this Presiding Officer came is also significant. Baltimore today prides itself on being a Southern City, though north of that line which is supposed to divide the two sections of the country. It is near Washington, and, at the same time, not far from Virginia. One month before the meeting of the Assembly, the Sixth Massachusetts Regiment, on its way to take part in the fight against the South, was attacked by a body of citizens in the streets of Baltimore. This resulted in firing and in the loss of life. During the meeting of the Assembly of the next year (1862), Dr. Backus joined in a protest against the drastic "Breckenridge Resolution." (See page 60) Taken altogether, it was a propitious beginning for the Court, and many were led to believe that national strife would not find its way into the Assembly.

The Gardiner Spring Resolution

But the storm without was not to be excluded from the sessions of that body. On Saturday morning, May 18th, Dr. Gardiner Spring, of New York, signalled the entrance of such matters by offering a resolution, calling for the appointment of a "Special Committee," "to inquire into the expediency of this Assembly making some expression of their devotion to the Union of these States, and their loyalty to the Government; and if in their judgment it is expedient so to do, they report what that expression shall be." (AMUSA-1861-303) His resolution, however, was tabled by a vote of 123 to 102. As soon as this was accomplished, it was moved that the resolution be taken up from the table. The resulting discussion occupied the remainder of the Assembly's time until the order of the day arrived. (303)

A truce, outward at any rate, seems to have been called for the next several days, but on the following Wednesday Dr. Spring, thoroughly persistent, forced the matter upon the attention of the Assembly once more. This time it came in the form of a paper "with resolutions respecting the appointment of religious solemnities for the 4th of July next, and the duty of ministers and churches in relation to the present condition of the country." Friday morning was set as the time for its consideration. (308) On Friday, as the first order of the day, the discussion occupied the Assembly throughout the morning session. Dr. Hodge proposed a substitute for the paper of Dr. Spring, after a motion to adopt the latter had been made. (315) At 4 o'clock in the afternoon of this same day the argument was resumed as unfinished business. Nothing resulted save the consumption of the remainder

of time until adjournment. (315)

On the following (Saturday) morning the orders of the day were set aside for the consideration of the absorbent topic of the day previous. Again the Assembly was occupied solely with the question; and the time for devotional exercises found the theme set as the order of the day for Monday, May 27th, at 11 o'clock. No agreement was reached at that time, and the Court was forced to adjourn for a noon-day prayer meeting with no solution in sight. At the Monday evening session the substitute of Dr. Hodge was withdrawn, and another substitute offered by Dr. Wines. After a season of discussion, Dr. Hodge made a motion to lay the whole matter on the table. This was defeated by a vote of 87 to 153. (322)

Tuesday morning brought no promise of settlement. The Assembly instructed a Special Committee to report back some form of proposed action. This was composed of Drs. Musgrave (Pennsylvania), Dodge (New Jersey), Yeomans (Pennsylvania), Anderson (California), Wines (Missouri), ministers; and Messrs. Ryerson (New Jersey), Giles (Maryland), White (Tennessee), and H. K. Clarke (Michigan), ruling elders.

At the hour appointed, the Committee, through Dr. Musgrave, presented its report, which had been adopted by a vote of eight to one:

"Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God towards this favored land, and also recognizing our obligation to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopts the following resolutions:

"Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, Monday, the first day of July next, be hereby set aside as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that on that day ministers and people are called upon humbly to confess and bewail our national sins, to offer our thanks to the Father of lights for his abundant and undeserved goodness to us as a nation, to seek his guidance and blessings upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as upon the Congress then about to assemble, and to implore Him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honorable peace.

"Resolved, 2. That the members of this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare their obligation, so far as in them lies, to maintain the Constitution of these United States in the full exercise of all its legitimate powers, to preserve our beloved nation unimpaired, and to restore its inestimable blessings to every portion of the land.

"Resolved, 3. That in the present distracted state of the country, this Assembly, representing the whole Church, feel bound to abstain from any further declaration, in which all our ministers and members faith-

ful to the Constitution and Standards of our Church, might not be able conscientiously and safely to join, and therefore, out of a regard as well to the interests of our beloved country, as to those of the Church, the Assembly adopts this Minute as its deliverance on this subject."

But no such measures would suffice. Dr. Anderson immediately offered a minority report, consisting of Dr. Spring's Resolution with a slight alteration. Both reports were accepted. Upon a motion to adopt that of the majority, discussion continued till the time set for adjournment. On the following morning it was "Resolved, That the final vote on this business be taken this afternoon at 6 o'clock."

Discussion, preliminary to the taking of the vote, began at 4 o'clock. Dr. Musgrave moved to amend the report (Majority) by inserting in the second resolution, after "the United States," the following, "and our constitutional rulers, in the full exercise of all their legitimate powers." This amendment was lost. The Majority Report was then voted on, and defeated.

The Minority Report was next taken up, and after amendment, was adopted by the Assembly by the vote of 156 to 66. This historic paper reads:

"Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God toward this favored land, and also recognizing our obligations to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

"Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, the first day of July next be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds; and that on this day ministers and people are called on humbly to confess and bewail our national sins; to offer our thanks to the Father of light for his abundant and undeserved goodness towards us as a nation; to seek his guidance and blessing upon our rulers, and their counsels, as well as on the Congress of the United States about to assemble; and to implore him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of an honourable peace.

"Resolved, 2. That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligations to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage, the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution: and to this Constitution in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty.

"And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declare that by the terms "Federal Government," as here

used, is not meant any particular administration, or the peculiar opinions of any particular party, but that central administration, which being at any time and inaugurated according to the forms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence."

The great importance of, and consideration here accorded, this document can be appreciated only when we realize that the Presbyterian Church in the United States (formerly known as The Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America) based its reason for a separate existence on the passage of this resolution by the General Assembly of the Old-school Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. With this fact in mind, no difficulty is encountered in appreciating the minute examination to which the Spring Resolution is subjected at this point.

The claim of the Southern Church that the Resolution was a political declaration, and therefore contrary both to the nature and the Constitution of the Church, must be either attested or rejected.

A statement of what might be called the Northern viewpoint--although as we shall see many Northern Presbyterians held no such ideas--is to be found in the words of R. E. Thompson, in the "American Church History Series, Presbyterians" (154):

"Those who stood by the Spring Resolutions had the whole history of the church, the teaching of the Confession, and the authority of God's Word on their side.

The Protest (Here reference is made to the Hodge Protest) implied a condemnation of Knox and Calvin, of the General Assembly of 1638, of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, of the Revolution Assembly of 1690 and of the American Synods of 1772-82. It is impossible to see how ^{Presbyterianism} can have perpetuated its existence on either side of the Atlantic if the Kirk had acted on the theories of the Hodge Protest and had renounced its claim to "treat in an ecclesiastical way of greatest and samllest matters, from the king's throne, that should be established in righteousness, to the merchant's balance that should be used in faithfulness." The document was another index of the extent to which pietism of the awakening had displaced the theocratic conception which lies so near the core of historic Presbyterianism."

A number of questions might well be raised in connection with these statements of Dr. Thompson, but our concern is with the Gardiner Spring Resolution, and the relation which it bears to the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church.

Was the Gardiner Spring Resolution a political declaration ?

Note the simple record entered by an ex-Stated Clerk of the Northern Assembly (W. H. Roberts-"A Concise History of the Presbyterian Church-61):

"Dr. Gardiner Spring, a commissioner from the Presbytery of New York, offered resolutions recommending a day of prayer, professing loyalty to the Federal government, and declaring it a duty to support that government and preserve the Union."

The mere statement answers the question; for the whole issue was the political point as to whether a citizen should support the government of his State or that of the Nation at Washington when a choice was necessitated between the two. According to Dr. Roberts, the issue was flatly decided by the General Assembly.

Was the Gardiner Spring Resolution a political declaration?

The answer of the very body which passed the pronouncement to the Hodge Protest reads in part (Paragraph 3):

"That the action of the Assembly has political as well as moral bearings, is readily admitted. So had the decisions of our Divine Master, when he said to the Pharisees and Sadducees, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's,' Mark xii:17; a decision still binding upon all men and underlying this very action of the Assembly."

In the somewhat caustic words of Dr. Thomas Carey Johnson, "They 'readily admitted' that the Assembly's action had political as well as moral bearings; and then went on to produce an almost matchless specimen of pettifoggery and sophistical demagoggery in the vain attempt to support the Assembly as just and Scriptural in its conduct." ("American Church History Series"- "Southern Presbyterians"-330) Need we pause to remark that the vagaries as to the command enjoining obedience to Caesar are beside the issue, since the whole question was, whether the State or the Federal Government stood in the place of Caesar?

Was the Gardiner Spring Resolution a political declaration ?

We now turn to the expressions of those members of the Assembly who saw the evil of such a deliverance. From that protest, signed by Dr. Charles Hodge and 57 other members of that Court, which has come down to us under the title of "The Hodge Protest," (Appendix D) we learn that a large number of the members of the very Assembly which made the deliverance returned an affirmative answer to the query which introduces this paragraph.

(The Hodge Protest must also be included in the list of documents originating in the 1861 Meeting of the Old-school Assembly which greatly illumine the subsequent action taken by Southern Presbyterians in the establishment of a separate Church. Its importance is two-fold: First, as an expression of the conviction of a very substantial portion of the commissioners to that Assembly on the nature and constitutionality of the Spring Resolution; Secondly, as an anticipation of the position to be taken by Southerners in regard to the same matter.

The significance of the second phase is well stated by Prof. R. C. Reed (1922):

"The character and purport of these resolutions, as they were, and still are, regarded by the Presbyterians of the South, cannot be set forth more clearly than they were set forth at the time in the protest offered by the eminent theologian, Dr. Charles Hodge." ("History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World"-272)

The Protest likewise gives some insight into the lack of unanimity of the Assembly in adopting the Resolution. While the

proposal sponsored by Dr. Spring was carried by a vote of 156 to 66, 58 commissioners affixed their names to the objections raised by Dr. Hodge. In so far as the Resolution was concerned it was quite clear that even the Assembly presented the spectacle of a house divided against itself. It is small cause for surprise that Southern Presbyterians would violently object to such action, when so great a percentage of the members of what was in reality a Northern court so vigorously protested against the passage of the declaration.)

The following passages from the Protest indicate its general nature:

"....we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due..."

"That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, is in our judgment undeniable. It asserts not only the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to 'strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government.' It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the

citizens of that State are bound by the laws of God to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizens is due to the United States; anything in the Constitution, or ordinances or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding."

"....In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country. The question is, whether the allegiance of our citizens is primarily to the State or to the Union. However clear our own convictions of the correctness of his decision may be yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide."

"It is the allegiance of the Old-school Presbyterian Church to the Constitution, the Union, and the Federal Government, which this paper intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity, decide the political question which agitates the country. It pronounces or assumes a particular interpretation of the Constitution. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly."

In such definite terms as these did a substantial portion of the representatives to the Philadelphia Assembly condemn the action previously taken by that body; and, incidentally, a most lucid statement was given of the exact point in which that Assembly, not only digressed, but transgressed.

Was the Gardiner Spring Resolution a political declaration ?

We turn to find the opinion of that paper held by the leaders of the Southern Church. Dr. B. M. Palmer, the first Moderator of the general Assembly of the CHURCH, in a Memorial Address before the Assembly of 1886, on the occasion of the Quarter-Centennial of that body, spoke of the High Court of the Old-school Church of 1861:

"It undertook to settle the question which had divided the statesmen of this country from the beginning, as to where the sovereignty resided, and to whom the allegiance of the citizen was primarily due. This was the question which the church, from her very nature, was incompetent to discuss; and which, from her express law, was inhibited from entertaining."

In his "Life of W. H. Thornwell," the Great Orator again treats of the Resolution:

"The utterance was exclusively and intensely political. It touched, as with the point of a needle, the precise issue upon which the war turned....This question, lying wholly within the domain of politics, the General Assembly assumed the right to determine...(Page 502)

Rev. James A. Waddell agrees:

"...But never in the history of the church was there an occasion when such a course was more contrary to the example of Christ, than that presented in our late Civil War. It was undertaken by the Church, not only to urge the duty of loyalty to constituted government, but

when the question was, which was the true object of loyalty, to determine for the people the very point which they claimed a right to settle for themselves."

(SPR-April, 1883-"Political Religion")

A present-day writer upon the subject, in treating the matter from a Southern point of view, has said:

"A burning question which confronted every Southern man was whether he owed his allegiance to the Federal Government or to his own state which had become a part of the Confederate Government. We can all see at once that this is a political question to be decided by a man's own conscience, and not a religious question to be decided by a church court. General Robert E. Lee had to face this question. He held a high position in the Federal army and could have been commander-in-chief. He was opposed to secession. When his native State of Virginia seceded, the question arose as to whether he owed his first allegiance to the Federal Government or to his own native State of Virginia. He promptly resigned his position in the army and gave his whole allegiance to his native state." (W. L. Lingle-"Presbyterians"-143)

Thus we see that friends admitted that the Gardiner Spring Resolution had "political bearings;" that Northern sympathizers assailed it as deciding "the great political question which agitates the country," and as being "a question which this Assembly has not the right to decide;" that Southern Presbyterians did, and do, deny the natural or the constitutional right of

the Assembly to make such a decision. Finally, the student with an understanding of the political situation in the United States in the year 1861 (Such as has been meagerly sketched in the opening pages of this section) must turn from a careful reading of the Resolution itself, in general, if not exact, agreement with the sentiments expressed above.

We have quoted the words of Dr. Palmer, in which he declared that the nature of the Church forbade the settlement of such a question by the High Court of the Presbyterian Communion. It is fitting that this phase of the matter be treated more fully at this juncture. It was the Great Head of the Church who laid down the principle that His Kingdom is not of this world; and, thereupon decried the employment of worldly weapons in its extension. The Master Apostle echoed this doctrine of his Lord when he taught that, "though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh."

The CHURCH has, throughout its history, been a high advocate of the Presbyterian and Reformed principle of the necessity of Divine authorization for guidance in all acts and forms to be employed in the work, worship, and faith of the Christian Church. An exposition of this teaching is to be found in the "Southern Presbyterian Review" of January, 1884, from the pen of Professor Wm. E. Boggs, of the Chair of Church History of Columbia Theological Seminary. Under the caption, "Church and State in their Reciprocal Relations and Fundamental Contrasts," he says:

".....How do Presbyterians, holding the 'jus divinum' doctrine as to the constitution of the Church, justify themselves in consenting to such an alliance with the

State ? (Here reference is made to the British Confession and its teaching on this subject) With them, philosophical speculations on this subject must be highly esteemed. They admit the Church to be a positive institute, grounded on the word of God, and not deducible by reason from the nature of things. As such she lives and moves and has her being in the utterances of the divine oracles. The maxim of this Presbyterianism is, Whatsoever is not commanded is therefore forbidden. Now all parties acknowledge that there is no authorization of such a relation in the New Testament, the most that is claimed as regards the New Testament being that it does not forbid the connection." (Page 160)

The same idea is exemplified in an article by James A. Waddell (SPR-Jan.-1869), in which he argues that the Church cannot enter court to decide political questions because the Scriptures do not empower her to do so. The above position is representative of the historic attitude of the CHURCH in regard to this question. In fine: The Southern Presbyterian Church teaches that the nature of the Body of Christ forbids the making of political decisions by the Church.

Another obstacle prevents the legitimate rendering of opinion on such matters by the Church. Not only by nature, but by law, as well, is the Presbyterian Church forbidden to enter into the arena of things political. The Confession of Faith, Chapter XXXI, Section II, lists those things which belong to synods and councils. We look in vain for that which would warrant such actions.



Moreover, it is to be noted in Section IV of the same Chapter that:

"Synods and councils are to handle or conclude nothing, but that which is ecclesiastical: and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs which concern the commonwealth unless by way of petition in cases extraordinary; or by way of advice for satisfaction of conscience, if they be thereunto required by the civil magistrate."

As to the limiting clauses, we again refer to the article by Professor Boggs (SPR-Jan., 1884-177, 178):

"It has never been maintained, I believe, that the action (Gardiner Spring Resolution), against which we protest as subversive of the Constitution and as a violation of Scripture, was taken under either of the two exceptional heads. The justification has been that a question of duty was pressing for an authoritative settlement, and whatever was done by the Assembly was only to that end. The reply is, Precisely so; a political question was tacitly but really decided in order to reach the question of duty."

The Hodge Protest agrees that the Spring Resolution was a violation of the Church's Constitution (Appendix D-Paragraph 9):

"The General Assembly in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the Constitution of the Church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master."

At this point we would stress a fact that must be kept in mind during this entire discussion, namely: That the righteousness of the South's political contention as to the object of allegiance need not be established in order to prove that the Gardiner Spring Resolution was wrong. The argument is not that the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America of 1861 made an unjust political decision, but rather that it did make a political decision; not only that it was wrong for the Assembly to make an unrighteous political decision, but that the making of a political decision was in itself wrong. The essence of the error lay in the making of such a decision at all.

The heart of the matter is laid bare in The Address to the Churches (Paragraph 6) in these words:

"A political theory was, to all intents and purposes, propounded, which made secession a crime, the seceding States rebellious, and the citizens who obeyed them traitors. We say nothing here as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of these decrees. What we maintain is that, whether right or wrong, the Church had no right to make them; she transcended her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State."

The venerable author of the Spring Resolution had written, in 1852:

"In the political history of the world, we see many events which perplex us by their intricacy, that our very knowledge of them confounds us; nor are we duly sensible of our embarrassment until we try to thread

out the labyrinth." ("The Glory of Christ"-Volume I-9)
 And the situation created by the passage of his motion was to sound an "Amen" to the sentiments of that earlier date. Will Rogers, the foremost American humorist of the age, contends that facts do not always conform to argument--that it is not profitable to argue with a man as to whether or no he has a pain in his stomach. Such was the case with the Resolution. Affirmations of loyalty to the Central Government did not create such loyalty in the hearts of those who considered it their duty to yield allegiance to their respective States and to the Confederate States. The paper expressed loyalty that was, upon the very face of the matter, denied by fact.

When the Resolution was passed by the Assembly, ^{ten} eleven of the States had withdrawn from the Union. Within seven months from that date, the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America was organized with 70,000 members. Four months before the convening of the Philadelphia Assembly, J. H. Thornwell, Moderator of the Old-school Assembly of 1847, had written of the secession of South Carolina: "I am heart and hand with the State in her move." ("Life of J. H. Thornwell"-436) In the same volume (Page 502) Palmer, referring to the seceded States, writes:

"A pledge was made on their behalf by the Assembly, which it was not possible for them to redeem; so that, in the language of Dr. Hodge's own protest, they were driven 'to choose between allegiance to their State and allegiance to the Church.' "

The Majority Report of the Committee on Resolution of the Assembly had foreseen this situation, as indicated in the third paragraph of their proposed resolution:

".....in the present distracted state of the country, this Assembly, representing the whole of the Church, feel bound to abstain from any further declaration, in which all our ministers and members faithful to the Constitution and Standards of our Church, might not be able conscientiously and safely to join..."

It was impossible for the ministers and members of the Church in the South to be subject to the existing government which actually ruled over them, and, at the same time, carry out that which was pledged in their behalf by the Resolution. A most sensible statement from "A Pastoral Letter from the General Assembly to the Churches under its Care," issued by the CHURCH in 1865, is pertinent here: "The relation of the Church of Christ to civil government is not only de jure but de facto." (AM-1865-382)

An authority, surely shorn of all prejudice in the matter, in dealing with Romans, 13, observes (H. C. G. Moule):

" 'The powers that be' is a phrase which, on the whole, accepts authority de facto, irrespective of its theory, or of its circumstances of origin. Just so both human and Divine law, after no long lapse of time, recognize property de facto, irrespective of circumstances of acquisition." ("Cambridge Bible"- "Epistle to the Romans"-214)

Thus it appears that, as a political declaration, the Gardiner Spring Resolution was opposed both to the nature and to the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church; and gave expression to loyalty to the Federal Government on the part of tens of thousands of Presbyterians, which loyalty was denied by fact.

The Hodge Protest

We have already seen that such violation of principle was not to pass unnoticed by those members of the Assembly who realized the evil which lay in the Spring Resolution. A classic protest is to be found in that paper printed in the Minutes of that year, under the title, "Protest of Dr. Hodge and Others." The importance attached to this document has already been indicated.

In accord with the general practice under such circumstances, a committee was appointed by the Assembly to draw up an answer to the objections raised in the Protest. Likewise, in accord with the results generally thus obtained, the Answer thus rendered proved to be far inferior to that to which it was intended to reply. This Answer to the Hodge Protest is printed in the Appendix (E), not for any merit which it possesses, but in order that the reader may form his own conclusions as to its success in achieving the ends for which it was designed.

A sort of ecclesiastical family skeleton, this paper has been closeted for decades; and only necessity would call for

its exhibition at this time. It has never been emphasized by the Northern Church, and wisely so. Though not nearly so violent as other pronouncements of that body along the same line, it is characterized by such weakness as is seldom seen in similar fields of endeavor.

The ^{sole} lone point at which this Answer may be complimented is the ingenious manner in which Dr. Hodge was presented as being inconsistent with himself. This learned scholar, as Editor of "The Princeton Review," had printed an article from his own pen, in the January, 1861, number of that journal, on "The State of the Country." This yielded sweet morsels for those who were confronted with the difficult task of answering his protest; and was profusely quoted in that answer, in such a manner as was designed to burn the iron into the soul of that theologian.

The five objections raised against the Gardiner Spring Resolution by The Hodge Protest (after Dr. W. L. Lingle-"Presbyterians"-143,144) have been arranged in columns parallel with the answers accorded them in the official reply of the Assembly:

The Hodge Protest
 "(1) 'We deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians is due.'

(2)

Answer to The Hodge Protest
 "That the action of the Assembly has political as well as moral bearings, is readily admitted." (3)

"(2) 'The action of the Assembly makes loyalty to the Federal Government a term of membership in the church.' (8)

"(3) 'The action of the Assembly was altogether unnecessary and uncalled for.' (13)

"(4) 'We regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren.' (16)

"(5) 'The act of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the church, but will greatly weaken its power for good. ' " (17)

(Inclosed numerals after quotations refer to paragraphs as printed in Appendix)

"But we deny that the deliverance of the Assembly establishes any new term of communion." (6)

"Yet, on the admission of these protestants themselves, it is a 'notorious fact,' that many of our ministers and members believe themselves absolved from all obligations of loyalty to our National Government." (10)

"We need only reply, that the roll of this Assembly shows delegates from Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. All might have been as easily represented." (11)

"As to the final ground of protest, it is enough to record our simple denial of the opinions expressed." (12)

The major weakness of the Answer lay in the fact that it entirely ignored the whole point at issue in the political struggle. Note the expressions (and their implications):

"Surely the idea of the obligation of loyalty to our Federal Government is no new thing to Presbyterians." (8); "In the seventy-four years of our existence, Presbyterians have known but one supreme government, one nationality, within our wide-spread territory. We know no other. History tells of none." (6);--and then the entire question is begged in the words: "The Federal Government acknowledges none." (6)

In essence, the Answer simply said that there was no political question to be decided. This was untrue. The very facts of history have belied such a statement. Bear in mind that, at the very time of the drafting of this response, ^{ten} ~~eleven~~ states, with a population of over eight and one-half millions, had withdrawn from the Union, and had officially disavowed the Central Government. Four years of the horrors of war were to testify to the fact that there was a political question to decide, and that the decision was not to come in any such nonchalant manner as that assumed by the paper in question.

In Paragraph 6, we read: "Would you have us recognize, as good Presbyterians, men whom our own government, with the approval of Christendom, may soon execute as traitors?" Comment upon such extravagant expressions is unnecessary. It is true that one man was half-heartedly arrested for his connec-

tion with the Confederate Government. It happened that he was a member of the Episcopal Church, and was released in not a great while (President Jefferson Davis).

The Spring Resolution was passed in the green tree; in the dry, the Assembly stepped far beyond their first action. Thus, in the year 1862, we find a paper, introduced by Dr. R. J. Breckenridge, passed by a vote of 206 to 20. A portion of its contents follows:

"I.....Peace has been wickedly superseded by war, in its worst form, throughout the whole land; and public order has been wickedly superseded by rebellion, anarchy, and violence, in the whole Southern portion of the Union. All this has been brought to pass in a disloyal and traitorous attempt to overthrow the National Government by military force, and to divide the nation contrary to the wishes of the immense majority of the people of the nation, and without satisfactory evidence that the majority of the people in whom the local sovereignty resided, even in the States which revolted, ever authorized any such proceeding, or ever approved the fraud and violence by which this horrible treason has achieved whatever success it has had. This whole treason, rebellion, anarchy, and violence, is utterly contrary to the dictates of natural religion and morality, and is plainly condemned by the revealed will of God. It is the clear and solemn duty of the National Gov-

ernment to preserve, at whatever cost, the national Union and Constitution, and to maintain the laws in their supremacy, to crush force by force, and to restore the reign of public order and peace to the entire nation, by whatever lawful means are necessary thereunto. And it is the bounden duty of the people who compose this great nation, each one in his several place and degree, to uphold the Federal Government and every State Government, and all persons in their authority, whether civil or military, in all their lawful and proper acts, unto the end herein set forth." (AMUSA-1862)

To characterize the foregoing as having "political bearings" would be an exceeding mild statement. Let us remember that this declaration was the official act of the General Assembly of the Northern Church; and that its passage was by an overwhelming majority. When the Stated Clerk of that body in the year 1928, points to the historic freeness of his communion from dabbling in political affairs (As that official has only recently done), it must have been with a memory untaxed by the events of sixty years ago.

Time and space forbid the attention being accorded the Breckenridge Resolution which such a glaring violation of the principles of Spirituality demands; yet we will pause to note several instances in which it offends the idea of the separation of the Church and State, as well contradicting the fundamental ideas of truth.

In the beginning, the Resolution is not even a true statement of political conditions. When it is said that the conditions in the Southern States were brought about "without satisfactory evidence that the majority of the people in whom the local sovereignty resided, even in the States which revolted, ever authorized any such proceedings," we are reminded more of the careless contentions of a political orator in the heat of a campaign, than of the orderly proceedings of a court of the Lord Jesus Christ. At this point the members of the Assembly must either have been supremely ignorant of what had taken place in the South--a lack of knowledge for which as a Spiritual court they were not subject to criticism. On the other hand, when, as such a body, the Assembly plunged into consideration of, and deliverance concerning, the political situation in the country, care at least should have been taken to have based such action upon a correct idea of what had actually taken place. In other words, the Assembly not only showed a total disregard of the whole idea of the Spirituality of the Church, but exhibited a woeful lack of respect for the the actual status of political affairs in the South.

We quote from Henry E. Chambers ("Higher History of the United States"-366):

"South Carolina took the first step. A convention of her sovereign people assembled^a and passed an ordinance of secession (December 20, 1860), by which act South Carolina repealed the ordinance by which she had ratified the Constitution of the United States, resumed the power which she had surrendered to the

Federal Government, and declared herself to be once more a sovereign and independent State. Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Louisiana, in the order named, followed the example of South Carolina."

"Public order has been wickedly superseded by rebellion, anarchy, and violence, in the whole Southern portion of the Union," reads the Resolution. To this charge we hear the Moderator of that same Assembly of the year 1847 (J. H. Thornwell) reply. Writing from Columbia, in January, 1861, he said:

"The rumours about mob law in this State are totally and meanly false. The internal condition of our society never was sounder and healthier. The law never was so perfectly supreme. Every right and interest of the citizen is completely protected; and our people are bound together in ties of mutual confidence, so strong that even private feuds are forgotten and buried. The whole State is like a family, in which the members vie with each other in their zeal to promote the common good. There is even little appearance of excitement." (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-486)

As to the charge that "This whole treason, rebellion, anarchy and violence, is utterly contrary to the dictates of natural religion and morality, and is plainly condemned by the revealed will of God," "it is enough to record our simple denial," both as to the basis of the statement and as to all implications therefrom.

In the Breckenridge Resolution we note that, not only is the Federal Government instructed as to how it is to meet the emergency, but all its citizens, Presbyterians and Free-thinker alike, in fact, "the people who compose this great nation," are called upon to "crush force by force," by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

The charge of treason has long since been dispelled by history herself.

Four separate protests were filed by members of the Assembly to this thoroughly political Resolution.

Let it not be supposed, however, that the Assemblies of the Old-school Presbyterian Church were sinners above all Galilaeans. The General Assembly of the New-school Church surpassed even their compatriots in political declarations. The Assembly (New-school) of 1861 expressed itself in such language as:

"Whereas, a portion of the people of the U. S. A. have risen up against the rightful authority of the Government; have instituted what they call the 'Confederate States of America;' in the name and defense of which they have made war against the United States; have seized property of the Federal Government; have assailed and overpowered its troops engaged in the discharge of their duty; and are now in armed rebellion against it; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America cannot forbear to express their amazement at the wicked-

ness of such proceedings, and at the bold advocacy and defense thereof, not only in those States in which ordinances of 'secession' have been passed, but in several others." ("Minutes of the New-school Assembly"-1861-111)

At the close of such deliverances we read:

"Resolved, 7. That a copy of these resolutions, signed by the officers of the General Assembly, be forwarded to His Excellency, Abraham Lincoln, President of the United States." (Page 112)

The Assembly of this same Church, at its meeting of the following year, advanced somewhat upon the previous deliverance:

"Resolved, 2. That rebellion against such a government as ours, and especially by those who have ever enjoyed their full share of its protection, honors, and rich blessings of every name, can have no excuse or palliation, and can be inspired by no other motives than those of ambition and avarice and can find no parallel, except in the two first rebellions--that which assailed the throne of heaven directly, and that which peopled our world with miserable apostates." ("Minutes of New-school Assembly"-1862-164)

The majestic figure of Robert E. Lee, foregoing the command of the Federal armies to assume the leadership of the forces of the Confederacy, rises to heights which avarice has never climbed, and stands as an eternal answer to such false accusations as have been hurled against that cause symbolized by the Southern Cross. We see him again, after the close of

the War, declining a princely salary from an insurance company, for the "use of his name," to turn his footsteps toward the west; and consecrate the last five years of a great life to the instruction of the youth of his beloved State, amid the blueness of her kindly hills. Do such actions as these betoken "avarice?"

When the same paper proceeds to make statements, ^{which} the necessary implications therefrom would classify Adams, Stonewall Jackson, and Satan as the representatives of different ages in the heights of transgression, we turn away with sad reflections of the wild heights to which a court of the Lord may rise, when it leaves its own province for an excursion into the domains of Caesar.

The New-school Assembly concurred with that of the Old-school Church in expressing its opinion of the Confederacy (Minutes-1862-1865):

"We believe that there is but one path before our people: this gigantic and inexpressibly wicked rebellion must be destroyed."

A very frank statement of what actually took place seventy years ago is to be found from the pen of a Northern literary critic, in the "New York Times Book Review," of Feb. 24, 1929 (4). In considering the book, "John Wilkes Booth," Poultney Bigelow says:

"We Northerners talked of our brother Christians beyond the Potomac as rebels, because they attempted to secede, much as the thirteen American Colonies did in 1776. George III ordered his Generals to burn such of our towns as had harbored "disloyals," and from 1861 to 1865 Lincoln was Commander-in-Chief of an army whose practices did not differ materially from those of the eighteenth century king."

Up to this point we note:

1. Two variant ideas were held by the people of the United States as to the supreme seat of government; and, therefore, as to that power to which allegiance was due. The South held that the State was sovereign; and, naturally, that citizens owed their allegiance primarily to that State in which they resided. The People of the North, on the other hand, placed the National Government first; and believed that the Federal Powers at Washington should be heeded above the call of native State. The sincerity of neither party is to be questioned on a historical basis.
2. A number of Southern States withdrew from the Union, beginning in December, 1860; because they believed that only in this manner could their rights be secured and preserved.
3. When the Federal Government attempted to force these so-called "Cotton States" back into the fold, several other States refused to aid in such a movement, and themselves seceded.
4. The Old-school General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, meeting under such conditions, in May, 1861, passed a resolution declaring that the exponents of the Northern Theory of government were right; and, at least by implication, making adherence to the Central Government a term of communion in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
5. This action was contrary both to the nature and Constitution of that Church; and made it absolutely impossible for the Churches of the Seceded States to remain within the Church.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE CONFEDERATE
STATES OF AMERICA

The call of President Lincoln for 75,000 troops to crush the Confederacy was, as we have seen, met by the secession of North Carolina (May 20), followed by Tennessee (June 8). On July 21, the major battle of the opening of the war was fought, at Manassas, Virginia; and the Federal Army was turned from its march upon Richmond, the Capital of the Confederate States, with many of its units in head-long flight toward the kindly shelter of their own capital at Washington. Congress, thereupon, approved the raising of \$500,000,000 and the recruiting of 500,000 men for the carrying on of the war. Operations of a more successful nature were begun against the Confederacy in the West.

Upon the adjournment of the Philadelphia Assembly, it became apparent that it was useless to speculate as to the possibility of the various churches of the Presbyterian Church of the Old-school remaining in one body. Had not the Gardiner Spring Resolution been passed, the political situation of the nation might have finally brought about a division.

The situation is well expressed by Rev. Professor R. C. Reed (1920):

"Evidently the Presbyterians of the South were in full political sympathy with the movement for the dismemberment of the general Government. Their sympathy was actually assisting in this disintegrating work. The Presbyterians of the North were just as heartily and actively in sympathy with the effort forcibly to put

a stop to the movement. Was it reasonable to expect that those who were political enemies would meet together in the courts of the Church and preserve intact the bonds of ecclesiastical brotherhood?" ("History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World"-271)

A review of the activities of Presbyterians throughout the nation during the days of the War, by a minister of the Northern Church, who can look back over those years of awful strife, with a mind cleared for the proper appreciation of his Southern brethren, is to be found in Dr. E. C. Macartney's "The Presbyterian Church and the Nation" ("Union Seminary Review"-July, 1926-332):

"In the great crisis of the American Civil War Presbyterians were arrayed against Presbyterians. The sons of the Presbyterians of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, of Virginia and the Carolinas, who fought the Revolution through to a successful issue, now found themselves in mortal combat. One reason that the Civil War lasted so long was because on both sides there were so many Presbyterian statesmen, generals and privates in the ranks."

When it became evident that the continuation of the Presbyterian Church in the United States in its ante-bellum form was out of the question, leaders of the Church in the South began to consider steps to be taken for the organization of the Church in the Confederate States. The Synod of Virginia appears to have made the first move of such a nature; for immediately af-

Presbytery:

"I wish you would have a pro re nata meeting of our Presbytery called, to appoint delegates to attend a convention at Greensborough, on the 15th of August. You may put my name to the circular requesting the Moderator to call the meeting. It is very important to take initiatory steps, while the Presbyteries are all harmonious, and before different schemes have got in agitation." (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-493)

In some instances, sessions of individual churches overtured their Presbyteries to sever all relations of an organic nature with the General Assembly, and to formulate plans for the constituting of a separate Assembly in those States which had withdrawn from the Union.

On September 13, 1861, the Session of the Rocky River Presbyterian Church, of Cabarrus County, North Carolina, met for the consideration of the Gardiner Spring Resolution. In years gone by, when the question of American Rights was in the air, the session of this Church, not as a session but as individual patriots, had played a notable part in the severance of relations with the Mother Country. Of the twenty-seven men who had signed the immortal Declaration of Independence (See the following Chapter), Rocky River had furnished three members of her session, in the persons of Elders Adam Alexander and Robert Query, and Rev. Hezekiah Balch. Mr. Balch was, as well, one of the Committee of Three which had drawn up the Declaration for the Convention. An extract from the records of this September meeting reads:

"Whereas, Moreover, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, did, in the city of Philadelphia, in May last--a mere minority of the Southern representation being present, pass resolutions which that body had no constitutional right to pass, and which--whilst we continue under that iniquitous government--necessarily bind our consciences to yield allegiance to it in all its monstrous absurdities, treacheries, and despotism:

"Therefore Resolved--

"1. That we as a church cannot any longer affiliate with the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, and therefore desire no longer to remain in ecclesiastical connection with that body--

"2. That in our solemn judgment, as the Session of this church, after much thought and prayer upon the subject: it is highly expedient that a Southern Presbyterian General Assembly be duly organized for the Confederate States of America, at as early a date as shall be practicable.--

"3. That we do hereby memorialize and overture the Presbytery of Concord, to which our ecclesiastical allegiance is due, to take definite and effective measures, to separate as speedily and peaceably as possible from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and to secure our connection with a General Assembly, based upon substantially the same system of doctrine and church

polity, proposed to be organized for the Confederate States of America." ("Minutes of Rocky River Congregation-1835"-233,234)

During the month of July, the Presbytery of New Orleans had renounced allegiance to the "northern Assembly; but, at the same time, had gone on record as opposing any plan for the holding of a convention, preferring to defer further action until a General Assembly could be organized. This important court, they suggested, might be created at a meeting proposed for Augusta, Georgia, on the 4th of December, 1861.

Dr. Thornwell gives extensive insight into what he conceived as the possibilities of the Convention, in an undated letter, written to Dr. A. A. Porter, the Editor of the "Southern Presbyterian Review:"

"I am glad to see that a call has been made for a Convention of the churches of the Confederate States, to determine their future relations. The Presbyteries should lose no time in calling pro re nata meetings, and electing their delegates. The number of delegates that each Presbytery should send ought to be the same as the number of commissioners to which it is entitled in the General Assembly. The Convention should, first of all, settle the question of separation from the churches in the United States. And, in the next place, if it determines to separate, it should prepare a constitution, to be submitted to the autumn Presbyteries; and, until the constitution is finally adopted, make arrangements for a Provisional Government. I would have preferred that the Convention had been called to

meet in Greensborough, North Carolina. Richmond, in July, will be very crowded, and it will be hard for the members to find accommodations. (It is evident that Dr. Thornwell has in mind the Convention proposed by the Synod of Virginia, for Richmond, on July 24th.) I think even yet the call should be changed from Richmond to Greensborough, or Raleigh." (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-494)

The result of the whole matter was a meeting, held in Atlanta, Georgia, on the 15th of August. Only eleven Presbyteries were represented, by twenty delegates; while fourteen "corresponding members" attended from six additional Presbyteries. This was an extremely small gathering to have been assembled in the name of the whole of the Church in the Southern States. The various plans of the different courts to hold meetings in various places, appears to have been reflected in the amazingly small attendance upon the sessions of the Convention. It is even likely that many of the churches were unaware of the fact that such a meeting was to be held, or that it had been in session. Thus in the transactions of the Rocky River Session (See above), no mention was made of the Convention, which had concluded its work almost a month before the deliverance of the lower court. Altogether, the Atlanta gathering must not have assumed any great proportions in the conduct of affairs in those days.

The Convention confined itself, almost entirely to suggestion, the endorsement of a temporary plan ^{for the conduct of} the foreign mission work of the CHURCH, forming the only exception. The time for

the first meeting of the ASSEMBLY being set for the following December, the Convention urged all Presbyteries of the Confederate States to send a full representation. ("Alexander's Digest"-1887-67,68)

Dr. Alexander (See foregoing reference) inserts the following note:

"On the subject of the war and the condition of the country, the Convention, though not a Church court, yet disclaimed the right to determine the political relations of individuals, or to solve for them political questions."

The General Assembly of the CHURCH met on the 4th of December, in Augusta, Georgia. The hesitation in participating in the earlier Convention was gone ~~by this time~~. Commissioners were present from all the forty-seven Presbyteries, which, by this time, had withdrawn from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The pastor of the First Church of Augusta, the host to the Assembly, was Dr. Joseph R. Wilson. His son, then a small child, was destined to prove one of the greatest of all Presidents of the United States, in the years to come.

Rev. Francis McFarland, D. D., was the presiding officer during the opening devotional exercises, upon the conclusion of which, he constituted the Assembly with prayer. Dr. B. M. Palmer, of New Orleans, preached the opening sermon. Like the keynote orator of the present-day political convention, he struck straight at the situation, and spoke on the "Headship of Christ

Over the Church." The text was Ephesians 1:22,23. The burden of his great discourse was that Christ is indeed the Head of the Church, and the mission of that Church is not in any way political, but purely spiritual. (Lingle-"Presbyterians"-144, 145) The strains of that sermon have not died away; through the more than three score years of the CHURCH'S life they have reechoed time and again through the halls of her courts, and are wrought into the very fibers of her being. It was, indeed, an inaugural of which she was often to think in days to come.

The organization of the Assembly brought the Moderator-ship to Dr. Palmer, while Dr. John N. Waddell was chosen Stated Clerk. The Assembly determined to be governed by the rules and precedents of the Church from which its Presbyteries had so recently come out, until it was otherwise ordered. (AM-1861-7)

The action of the body in adopting its Constitution follows:

"That this Assembly declare, in conformity with the unanimous decision of our Presbyteries, that the Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory of Worship, which together make up the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, only substituting the term 'Confederate States' for 'United States.' " (AM-1861-7)

The name chosen for the CHURCH was "The Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America." Upon the termination of the War, in 1865, bringing with it the downfall of the Confederacy, it became necessary to make a change in this official design-

nation. The Assembly proved inadequate for the task. The Committee on Bills and Overtures recommended that the future title read "The Presbyterian Church in the United States;" and this was finally adopted. The other names proposed, along with the number of votes accorded each, in the Assembly of 1865, follows: 1. "The Presbyterian Church in the United States," 42; 2. "Presbyterian Church in the South," 7; 3. "American Presbyterian Church," 2; 4. "Protestant Presbyterian Church in the United States," 2. Yet the CHURCH is almost universally known in ordinary conversation as "The Southern Presbyterian Church," while many official documents of that body make reference to it as such. In the "American Church History Series" the article dealing with the communion is labelled "Southern Presbyterians." (It is interesting to note, in this connection, that a proposal from the Presbytery of Nashville, to change the name of the CHURCH to "The Church of Jesus Christ--Presbyterian in U. S.," died in the Assembly of 1928, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Bills and Overtures. (AM-1928-45))

Although held just across the State line, in Georgia, this was really a South Carolina Assembly. Just as the Palmetto State had been the first to withdraw from the Union, so were her sons to be the leaders in the organization and formulation of the policy of the Southern Presbyterian Church. True, Palmer, at the time, was pastor in New Orleans; but he had been born in Charleston. "I am a South Carolinian, you know," was his frequent explanation of his course of action in matters from time to time. (Johnson-"Life of B. M. Palmer"-18) The floor leader,

and most brilliant member of the Assembly, was likewise from that State. James Henley Thornwell was born in the Marlborough District of South Carolina; and at the age of 35 was elected Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old-school). Together they shaped the policy of that Assembly, and, to a great extent, that of the Church of the future.

One item which was brought before the Assembly must be mentioned at this point. Dr. Thornwell felt that the Government of The Confederate States should take action to the extent of recognizing Christ in the Civil Constitution. To this import, he introduced a memorial in the Assembly, overturing Congress to take such steps. At the conclusion of an article by Professor John B. Adger, in the July, 1863, number of the "Southern Presbyterian Review," we have an explanation of the purpose of the move in the words of its author:

'The whole substance of what we desire, may be expressed in the following or equivalent terms, to be added to the section providing for liberty of conscience:

'Nevertheless we, the people of these Confederate States, distinctly acknowledge our responsibility to God, and the supremacy of His Son, Jesus Christ, as King of Kings and Lord of lords; and hereby ordain that no law shall be passed by the Congress of these Confederate States inconsistent with the will of God, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures.' (SPR-July, 1863-87)

This strange overture was not pressed by its sponsor. We read in the "Minutes" of 1861 (21): "Dr. Thornwell asked and ob-

tained leave to withdraw the overture." Vigorous protests were made by certain members of the Assembly to the plan; and this fact, coupled with the setting of the time for the consideration of the measure on the eight day of the session, induced Dr. Thornwell to recede from his original intention. (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-507)

"The Address to All The Churches of Jesus Christ
Throughout the Earth"

The most significant and far-reaching act of this Assembly was the issuance of an "Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth;" wherein the reasons for the existence of the new Church were set forth, and the hopes for the future of her mission were declared.

The exact intent prompting the drafting of such a paper may be gathered from the resolution passed by the Assembly in authorizing its promulgation:

"Resolved, That a committee, consisting of one minister and one ruling elder from each of the Synods belonging to this Assembly, be appointed to prepare an Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth, setting forth the causes of our separation from the churches in the United States, our attitude in relation to slavery, and a general view of the policy which, as a Church, we propose to pursue."
(AM-1861-7)

The resulting document was one of rare worth and merit.

Not only were the specific purposes before the mind of the Assembly attained, but an unparalleled statement of the true relation of the Church and State was propounded. "It is a notable document and should be read in full by every Southern Presbyterian," writes a present-day teacher of the CHURCH. (W. L. Lingle-"Presbyterians"-145) The Moderator of that historic Assembly gives his appraisal of the Letter in the following terms:

"It will stand as one of those documents to which the Church will ever appeal, as a testimony for the truth, in times of darkness and trial, when the witnesses for it were thought worthy only of being slain. It was not only expressed with that precision of language which was the characteristic of the illustrious author, but it was pervaded with a sacramental fervour, which stamped upon it the impression of a sacred and binding covenant." (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-504)

The practical usefulness of the Address as a source paper in the study of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church may be noted in the following chapter, where, time after time, it is quoted as indicating the position of Southern Presbyterians on such matters.

The literary excellencies of this paper may be illustrated by quotation from its 6th paragraph:

".....Sacred memories gathered around that venerable Church which had breasted many a storm and trained our fathers for glory. It had always been distinguished for its conservative influence, and many fondly hoped

that, even in the present emergency, it would raise its placid and serene head above the tumults of popular passion, and bid defiance to the angry billows which rolled at its feet."

It is not necessary to seek far for the author of this masterpiece. There was only one man in the Assembly who was capable of such work. Dr. Thornwell had proposed the original resolution to the Assembly, whereby the drafting of such a statement was authorized. It is no surprise to find him designated as Chairman of the Committee appointed for the drawing up of the paper; and we have the word of Dr. Palmer, himself, that the pen of his fellow-Carolinian shaped the words of the declaration. (Palmer-"Life of J. H. Thornwell"-504)

As a contemporary has said, it was after the fashion of the Scottish Covenants that the Address was adopted and signed. Judge Shepherd, a commissioner, moved that the names of the members of the Assembly be affixed to the document at the regular time for the calling of the roll on the morning after its adoption. Neither has the CHURCH been forgetful of those mighty men of old; for in the latest digest of the Acts of the General Assembly, two full pages are given over to the facsimile signatures of the founders of the CHURCH. ("Assembly's Digest"-1922-162,163)

It is not only interesting, but significant to note that, among the officers of the Assembly who, as such, first signed the Address to the Churches, was Joseph R. Wilson, the Permanent Clerk of that body. Surely an echo of that day must have been sounded, when a son of his, and of the CHURCH, stood before the

nations as a shaper of the better thoughts of mankind, in a palace of the Old World, a decade ago.

A Brief Analysis of The Address

Greetings !

I. Historical data concerning the CHURCH (1)

II. Reasons for the separate existence of the CHURCH

"We are persuaded that the interests of true religion will be more effectually subserved by two independent churches"(2)

1. Political deliverances of the General Assembly of the U.

S. A. Church make continued unity impossible (3-7)

2. Churches following national lines appear advisable (8)

3. The slavery question divides Northern and Southern Presbyterians (10ff)

III. Ends before, and proposed methods of work of the CHURCH (22)

Conclusion (23)

(Inclosed numbers refer to paragraphs of the Address as printed in the Appendix, Paper A)

We shall not, at this point, attempt to discuss the opening paragraphs of the Address to the Churches; for the obvious reason that they will receive attention elsewhere, in case they have not already been covered in the earlier part of this chapter.

The second ground for division, as outlined above, is deserving of, at least, passing comment. The fact that churches usually follow national lines is axiomatic so far as students of ecclesiastical history are concerned. It is the practice of

The Southern Presbyterian Church to form organizations of their workers and converts on the mission field; and thus carry out the idea expressed in this second head of the Address.

But it is the third cause of separate existence that merits our chief consideration at this time; for only at this point will any ^{further} treatment be made of the question of slavery. Let it be distinctly understood that the writer is making no effort to defend that institution.

In paragraph 12 slavery is represented as a civil matter, authorized by the existing government under which the members of the CHURCH were living:

"In the first place, we would have it distinctly understood that, in our ecclesiastical capacity, we are neither the friends nor the foes of slavery, that is to say, we have no commission either to propagate or to abolish it. The policy of its existence or non-existence is a question which exclusively belongs to the State."

The following efforts, however, to vindicate such involuntary bondage, are not to be understood as those held by the CHURCH in this day. The Address to the Churches, therefore, would have proved a more abiding document had the treatise on slavery remained unwritten.

But, whatever may be its failing in this respect, the Letter has long remained a compendium of Scriptural truth upon the subject of the relative provinces of the Empire of Caesar and the Kingdom of God. The precision of its statements is surpassed only by the accuracy with which it expounds the teachings

of the Church concerning these things--doctrine, which we believe to be in harmony with the Word of God. And if, in the treatment of one subject, it falls below that standard which has become universally accepted by all Christian people, it is not for us to let that fact obscure the heights to which it rises in the expression of those things which must ever form the precious heritage of the sons of that Church which has meant so much to those who live beneath these Southern skies, and drink from the glories of that land which our fathers have builded, under the guiding hand of a gracious God.

The sessions of the first Assembly were characterized by the absence of that political note which had been sounded by the corresponding court of the Church in the North. The commissioners had not met to deal with the affairs of civil government; these were left to the rightful authorities. The matters of eternity held the attention of those early men of God. In the words of Dr. Henry Alexander White ("Southern Presbyterian Leaders"-324):

"The members of this Assembly were in full sympathy with the men in the armies of the South, and yet there was not heard in the church in which the Assembly held its sessions even an echo from the field of war nor from the forum of political debate. The Court of the Church did not sound a call to arms, nor unfurl a flag, nor make an announcement of political principles."

The records of those days remain in order that men may read of how that peace of God which passeth all understanding may keep the minds of those who compose a court of the Lord Jesus

Christ fixed upon the things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. The very actions which this Assembly did not take constitute a crown and joy to those who have succeeded the giants of old of the CHURCH in the days of her passion. It is not to the strength of her own will, nor to the might of her own arm, that she owes that glorious witness to the Headship of the King; for even when she walked in the flames of the furnace, there appeared beside her one who was like unto the Son of God.

The foregoing chapter has brought to light the following facts:

1. Soon after the adjournment of the Philadelphia Assembly the leaders of Presbyterianism in the South came to realize that it was impossible for the Presbyterians of the North and of the South to work together in the same church organization.
2. Steps were taken immediately to effect an organization for the Presbyterian Church in the States which had withdrawn from the Union.
3. These efforts resulted in a Convention, which was held in Atlanta, Georgia, on the 15th of August, 1861. Here plans were laid for the first meeting of the Assembly of the new Church, which took place in Augusta, Georgia, on the 4th day of December of the same year.
4. This Assembly assumed, in the name of the CHURCH, the same doctrinal and governmental standards which were held by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
5. A declaration of principles and statement of policies was issued to the Churches of Christendom, under the title, "Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth."
6. A marked freeness from all political pronouncements and discussion characterized the entire meeting of the Assembly.

**THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE
TEACHINGS OF THE CHURCH**

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRITUALITY OF THE CHURCH

It need not be expected that the teachings of the Southern Presbyterian Church in respect to Spirituality will reveal any unusual positions as regards the other branches of the Presbyterian family. Her creed is essentially the same as that of the Church in other lands, not to mention the Presbyterian Churches of America. Yet a study of the teachings of the CHURCH concerning Spirituality is imperative insofar as our present purpose is concerned; and, at this point, an effort will be made to present a thorough transcript of those records of the ASSEMBLY of a Spiritual nature, in which the theoretical aspect of that question is laid bare. The leaders of the CHURCH will, furthermore, be called upon for expressions of their views on the same subject; and the resulting doctrines will, from time to time, be fitted into their proper settings in the entire Presbyterian system. (The official instructions in regard to this latter point are: "No one will expect you to enlarge on the attitude of the Presbyterian Churches on your subject, but you will be expected to allude to the respects in which the Southern Presbyterian Church diverges in point of view from sister churches and from--if it really does so--the general trend of Presbyterian thought." Letter from Prof. HW-28th Aug. 1928)

The words of a present-day writer of a neighboring denomination will be found doubly true when applied to the distinguishing characteristics of the Southern Presbyterian

doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church. Dr. Beverly D. Tucker, Jr., in the "Union Seminary Review" of January, 1928, observes that "as long as we are in the realm of general principles, doubtless we hold more or less a similar point of view. The point at which people begin to disagree is in the method by which such Christian citizenship is to be realized."

Certainly the doctrinal positions of the CHURCH have been anticipated in the years gone before; and this is not surprising. On the other hand, it is not unlikely that the true teachings of the Southern Church on this subject may be revealed, not so much by what is said in echo of the teachings of other Presbyterian bodies, as by that which is left unsaid, and its effect on those positive doctrines. Care has been taken in this connection to avoid the insertion of statements which, in themselves, appear to indicate certain positions; while, when construed in the whole of their context, would lead to a different conclusion.

It is, of course, unnecessary to explain that the quotations woven into the text of this chapter from the writings of the leaders of the Southern Presbyterian Church are not exhaustive. However, it is claimed that such references are thoroughly representative, and that the works of the recognized teachers of the CHURCH have so contributed to the treatment, as to secure adequate expression of the mind of the Church. Practically every doctrinal deliverance of the ASSEMBLY, ~~has~~ concerning the Spirituality of the Church, has been incorporated in this thesis, either under the present chapter, or in the other ~~the other~~ sections of our study which bear upon these matters.

I The Nature of the Church

The nature of the Church was indicated in the long ago by the Master Himself, when he declared, "My kingdom is not of this world." In what way is this truth expressed by the CHURCH?

In the "Address" we find the statement; "The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace." (Par. 5) A resolution, offered by Dr. Palmer, and adopted by the Assembly of 1866, reads:

"In view of the great controversy now pending in this country, upon the spirituality and independence of the Church as the visible kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ upon the earth; and in view of the fact that the Assembly did, at the time of its organization in 1861, plant itself firmly upon the ground, that the Church is a spiritual commonwealth, distinct from and independent of the State, be it therefore...."(AM-1866-37)

In 1876 we read, in a report touching the nature and function of the Church:

"1. Touching the nature and function of the Christian Church, we solemnly reaffirm the explicit and formal statement set forth at the time of the organization of our General Assembly in 1861, in an "Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth." This document clearly and forcibly declares our position concerning the character of the Church as a Spiritual body, and therefore "non-secular and non-political."
(AM-1876-233)

Such expressions are not intended to deny that the civil power is ordained of God; the CHURCH, on the other hand, most emphatically propounds this common doctrine.

In his opening sermon at the First General Assembly, Dr. Palmer, who was later elected Moderator of that body, insisted most strongly upon the sole Headship of Christ over the Church, and defined the mission of the Church as purely spiritual and in no sense political (See page 76).

Dr. H. W. McLaughlin, Director of the Work of the Country Church of the ASSEMBLY, in his book, "The New Call," says:

"In the very nature of the Divine intention the Church is unique among organizations. Every brotherhood, every organization except the Church is human in its origin and is temporal in its aims except as they have been inspired by the truths which are taught by the Church. The Church is God's divinely instituted society." (Page 111)

This position would necessarily forbid the consideration of any scheme similar to that of Establishment. The Civil Government has not brought the Church into being; that was the act of the King of kings. The wrecks which are strewn along the pathway of established churches, marking the march of progress toward the light, have no place in the interpretation placed upon the doctrine of the nature of the Church as held by the Southern Church. Agreement with such statements as that of Lord Justice Clerk Hope, in the Stewarton Case, would never be dreamed of:

"I cannot admit that an Establishment, instituted by Statute, can claim or legally possess, any authority from a Divine source, which the State, constituting the Establishment, may not have thought fit to acknowledge as belonging to it." ("Special Report on Stewarton Case, Bell and others" 53-20th January, 1843--Quoted from JB)

As a matter of fact, the question of Establishment was settled in America long before the Southern Presbyterian Church came into being; and the whole idea of any such thing, with the problems flowing therefrom, is utterly foreign to the thought of the CHURCH. The matter of the proper relation of Church and State will be touched upon at a later point; enough at this time to call attention to the fact that the idea of the nature of the Church precludes the possibility of a Church as the creature of the State.

The current thought of Presbyterianism is, of course, in full accord with the teachings of the Assembly and of the leaders of the CHURCH in regard to the nature of the body ecclesiastical. The application of such doctrine is another matter, in which such agreement is not always manifest.

2 The ends of the Church

Nor does the trumpet give forth an uncertain sound in regard to those ends for which the Church was instituted. The "Address" declares that "The state aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness." (Par. 5) In answer to an overture concerning the observance of days of fasting, thanksgiving

and prayer, when designated by the civil magistrates, we find this official deliverance made by the Assembly of 1866:

"...that there are two commonwealths, equally appointed by God: the civil, whose object is to protect the persons and property, and promote the well-being of men as they are members of civil society; and the religious, the commonwealth of Israel, whose object is to train men, as they are sinners, for glory and immortality." (AM-1866-15)

IN answer to a communication in regard to an effort to secure the passage of a Sabbath law, the Assembly of 1921 replied:

"It is not the practice of our Church to participate officially in matters of civil legislation; the function of the Church, as the Body of Christ, being, in our belief, spiritual and not civil." (AM-1921-61)

The voice of the teachers of the CHURCH is no less certain. Dr. Palmer declared, in his Quarter-Centennial Address before the Assembly of 1886, that "it is no unimportant mission to which we have been assigned in the adorable providence of God." And that mission to which he referred was the organized testimony in behalf of the Spirituality of Christ's Kingdom.

"Smyth's Catechism" ("Smyth's Works"-Vol. IV-485) has arranged the teaching in the form of question and answer:

"In what respects is this power, as government of the Church, spiritual?"

"Its objects are spiritual: namely, the souls and consciences of men. Its end is spiritual: namely,

the glory of God, in men..."

Dr. R. L. Dabney, in his text-book on Theology, writes:

"The Church is to teach men the way to heaven, and to help them thither. The State is to protect each citizen in the enjoyment of temporal rights." (874)

"The ends of the State are for the earth; those of the Church are for eternity." (879)

Dr. John F. Cannon (1899) wrote in the "Union Seminary Review" of April, 1916: "The Church and State are both ordained of God: but for different ends."

The significant difference between the Southern Presbyterian Church and Presbyterian Churches of other lands and ages to be found in this respect, hinges upon the idea of those who would invest the State with a part in the promotion of religion. This is a large problem in itself, assuming different aspects with the passing of time; and will be entered upon to some slight extent when we discuss the means to be employed in the advancement of the cause of the Church. With the general tenets which have been ascribed to the CHURCH, under this head, no difference of opinion is to be noted in the Presbyterian World.

John Dick, in the years before there was a Southern Church, anticipated the thoughts of its Assemblies and writers, in these words:

"The end of civil government is to promote the peace and happiness of the present life; the end of ecclesiastical government is the edification of the Body of Christ, the building up of the Saints in faith and holiness to life everlasting." (Vol. II-503)

3 Means of Advancement of the Church

What means should be employed for the propagation of the faith and the extension of the Kingdom as represented by the Church?

The "Address to the Churches" declares that "The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual; that of the State includes the exercise of force." (Par. 5) The General Assembly of 1883 decided that "it is not competent for the Church, in its organic capacity, to seek the intervention of the civil powers for the accomplishment of any of the ends before it, as a witness for the truth of God." (AM-1883-214)

"Smyth's Catechism" ("Smyth's Work-Vol. IV-485), in answer to the question, "How may you describe this power of the Church?," responds, "It is spiritual, and addressed to the consciences of those who are subject to it.." Dr. W. H. Thornwell (USA-Old-school-1847) opposed the general program of Denominational Education on the ground of the purely spiritual character of the Church; thinking that such a plan was not in keeping with the Scriptural ideal as to the means to be used in the work of the Church. (Palmer-"Life of W. H. Thornwell"-326)

Dr. Dabney teaches:

"The Church has no civil pains and penalties at her command; because Christ has given her none; and because they have no relevancy whatever to produce her object--the hearty belief of saving truth."
("Theology"-874)

Dr. T. E. Peck (1878), former Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary (Va.), in his collected writings, affirms: "The scope and aim of civil power is only things temporal; of the ecclesiastical power, only things spiritual." ("Miscellaneous of Rev. Thos. E. Peck, D. D., LL.²⁸⁷ M. D.")

The words of Dr. J. F. Cannon (1899), as they bear upon this phase of the question, are to be noted in the "Union Seminary Review" of April, 1916:

"Civil legislation is a function of the State, not the Church. It is a carnal weapon. It implies force. Behind it lies the power of the sword--a power which the State has been authorized to wield, but from which the Church has been strictly enjoined. Whenever she tries to use it she wounds herself."

Presbyterian ideas, as they stream down through the years, present a varied aspect so far as the means of advancement to be employed by, or in behalf of the Church are concerned. John Calvin would have the civil authorities lend aid in the preserving of order within the ranks of the flock, by providing punishment for those offenders for whom excommunication was deemed to be insufficient:

"But speaking of the exercise of civil polity.....
:its objects also are, that idolotry, sacrileges
against the name of God, blasphemies against the
truth, and other offences against religion, may not
openly appear and be disseminated among the people.
...Nor let any on think it strange that I now refer

to human polity the charge of the due maintenance of religion, which I may appear to have placed beyond the jurisdiction of men." ("Institutes"-Book IV-Chap. XX-Section III)

~~Thomas~~ Gillespie contravenes such practices with the sensible declaration that "Church censures must needs be dispensed by ministers and elders, because they are heterogeneous to the Magistracy. ("Aaron's Rod Blossoming"-London-1646-247) John Dick observes: "Civil governments can compel their subjects to obey the laws, but the church uses no compulsion, and employs only moral means to work upon the heart." ("Theology"-503) Hill echoes the same idea, when he writes:

My second general position is, that the power inherent in the nature of the Christian society, which, it derives from divine institution, and not from civil regulation, is mere spiritual power; in other words, it is one concerned only with the consciences of men, and gives no claim to any authority over their persons or their properties." ("Lectures in Divinity"-763)

Charles Hodge, in his "Church Polity," remarks:

"The New Testament, therefore, does not teach that the magistrate is entitled to take care that the true religion is established and maintained; that right men are appointed to church offices.. " (117)

Once more the matter is brought back to the question of Establishment. Admit the principle of Establishment, and the whole complexion of the situation is changed; deny Establish-

ment, and the use of civil pains and penalties in any shape, form, or fashion is unlikely to ever be considered. The position of the Southern Presbyterian Church is, of course, incapable of reconciliation with the paragraph of the British Confession of Faith which deals with the so-called Civil Magistrate. The necessity of seeking to explain the ideas of modern Presbyterianism with such doctrine was long ago obviated, by the revision of the Confession by the American Church. (1778)

But the CHURCH would not stop simply with the statement that religion is to be advanced by "spiritual means," but would add, "and spiritual funds." In other words, the question of State Support is one on which a very positive stand must be taken. Neither the sword nor the wealth of Caesar can be tolerated in the fight for the evangelization of the world. It is a well-known American, as well as American-Presbyterian, principle that "he who controls the purse-strings controls the institution dependent thereon. To participate in the proceeds is to become subservient to the source." The American citizen is incapable of distinguishing between State support and State control. It may be because of density, but whatever the reason, the two are to him inseparable.

This opposition to the use of State funds is not a matter of expedience. Unlike the "Defence" of the Seceders, which acknowledged that legal establishment was desirable in itself, but sometimes proved a snare in its workings (Macpherson-"Scotland's Battles for Spiritual Independence"-236), the CHURCH must receive its support in ways other than through grants in any way contaminated by the touch of the State. Voluntaryism

is regarded, not as by Chalmers, "as a matter of Christian economics," but as the God-given principle for the carrying on of the work of the Master. The CHURCH is opposed to all Establishments as bad, not simply to bad Establishments; for the fundamental principle of such an alliance is held to be wrong.

The full answer to all pleas for Establishment which are based on the inability of the Church to stand apart from the support furnished by the State, is to be found in the vitality of the Churches of the United States of America. Not only is Establishment wrong in principle, the CHURCH would say, but it is entirely unnecessary in practice.

Dr. Dabney enters into a full discussion of this question in his "Theology." (Pages 886-887) Among the theoretical objections to State support which he lists, are the following: The Church and State have different ends, and the agencies of the one are unfit for the other; If the State is to use part of its power ^(funds) to nourish the Church, it is its duty to use all (force)

In opposition to what he calls the "Chalmerian Theory," the author contends that voluntaryism is most efficient in advancing the work of the Church (See above), that endowment tends to tempt the clergy with ease, that endowment is oppressive and unfair. Finally, he points to the actual workings of the two plans as furnishing a conclusive argument from the pragmatic standpoint of the excellencies of the Free Church.

Dr. Russel Cecil (1911), in his recent popular "Handbook of Theology" (1923), touches upon the subject in these words:

"But, while all this is true, the Church should never interfere in the affairs of the State, and should not look to the State for support. It should be supported by the voluntary offerings of its membership." (92)

The historical attitude of the CHURCH toward Establishment must wait for treatment in its logical place.

Present-day practice, however, furnishes a rather curious anomaly along this very line. In certain sections of the South, where the work of the CHURCH is largely of a home-missionary nature, it is not an unheard of custom for the minister to receive a portion of his salary from some business corporation -- a coal mining company or lumber enterprise.

During the past week, the writer interviewed such a cleggyman, who is the recipient of a monthly pay-check from a coal corporation, operating in the vicinity of one of his churches--in fact, the building used for worship by that congregation belongs to the company. The President of the mining corporation naturally has a rather emphatic voice in the management of the church; while there is always the danger that the origin of the funds may prove the source of suggestions as to how the work is to be carried on. Commercial, like Civil, Establishment is a thing to be shunned by the Church.

II. The Separation of Church and State

Even to the casual observer it is evident that there must be certain canons of guidance for the Church and State in their reciprocal relations. The constituents of the Church are the citizens of the State; the spheres of control of Church and State are, to a great extent, the same. In the following sections it is proposed to discuss the teachings of the CHURCH in regard to those relations which should be maintained between these two great institutions.

~~Thomas~~ Gillespie, writing in "Aaron's Rod Blossoming" (246), observes: "I am sure the Heathens themselves have known the difference between the office of Priests and the office of Magistrates." We are touching upon a fundamental point in the handling of our general theme; for the attitude of the Church toward the State and that of the civil toward the ecclesiastical power will determine the ideas as to the spheres in which their respective work shall move.

"The provinces of the Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other," is the tenet of the "Address." (Par.5) The Palmer Resolution of 1866, which has been heretofore quoted, lays down the principle that "the Church is a spiritual commonwealth, distinct from and independent of the State." (AM-1866-37) The General Assembly of 1913 issued "A Brief Statement of Belief drawn from the Standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States," which sums up this question in the sentence, "We believe in the separation of church and state."

A rather precise instance in this connection arose in the

Assembly of 1920, in regard to the propriety of displaying national flags in the buildings of the local church. Instead of making an outright declaration concerning the matter, the Court passed the decision down to the Sessions of the various churches, thus manifesting a tendency appearing in these latter years of allowing the Session to bear the brunt of those questions hard to be understood. (AM-1920-79); (See also AM-1921-73: AM-1926-52)

The General Assembly of 1925 disapproved the use of the pledge to the Flag as a part of religious worship:

"In response to the overture from Concord Presbytery as to the pledge of allegiance to the national flag as a part of the worship of God at Leadership Training Conferences, the Assembly replies that while deeply interested in all these conferences, they make no official report, and therefore the Assembly is without full information, but it cannot approve of such use of the flag." (AM-1925-67)

Dr. Dabney who served during the War as a member of the staff of the immortal Jackson (in company with another minister of the CHURCH who only recently "crossed over the river" to rest "in the shade of the trees," Dr. J. P. Smith), treats the matter as follows: "Church and State are distinct institutions, since theocratic institutions are done away; they have distinct objects." ("Theology"-874) Dr. R. A. Webb, sometime Professor of Systematic Theology in Louisville Seminary, expresses himself: "The state and church--are entirely separate and distinct entities, both having divine origins but separate spheres

and functions, and can never be allied without degrading the divine ideal." ("Christian Salvation--Its Doctrine and Experience"-239) Dr. W. L. Nourse, in the "Presbyterian Quarterly" of January, 1897, writes: "The Christian man is a subject of both institutes, the church and the state, but bears a very different relation to them." (42)

Dr. Russell Cecil teaches: "The Church, as a spiritual body, is to be kept separate from the State." ("Handbook of Theology"-92) Dr. Thomas Carey Johnson, the present incumbent of the Chair of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary (Virginia), in the "American Church History Series," Vol. XI, page 423, succinctly states: "The true relation between Church and State should be that of respectful and friendly independence." This same idea is partially expressed by James Barr, in the words: "The first and fundamental duty of the State to religion is to leave it alone." ("Scottish Church Question"-189)

Dr. Stuart Robinson (1869) has, in his "Church of God," not only noted the fact of the difference between civil and ecclesiastical institutions, but compiled a list of those matters in which this dissimilarity subsists:

"1. In that the civil power derives its authority from God as the Author of nature, whilst the power ecclesiastical comes alone from Jesus as Mediator.

"2. In that the rule for the guidance of the civil power in its exercise is the light of nature and reason, the law which the Author of nature reveals through reason to men; but the rule for the guidance of eccle--

siastical power in its exercise is the light which, as Prophet of the Church, Jesus Christ has revealed in his Word. It is the government under statute laws already enacted by the King.

"3. They differ in that the scope and aim of the civil power are limited properly to things seen and temporal; the scope and aim of ecclesiastical power are things unseen and spiritual.

"4. They differ in that the significant symbol of the civil power is the sword....but the significant symbol of the ecclesiastical power is the keys. is a

"5. They differ in that civil power may be executed as a several power by one judge.....but all ecclesiastical power pertaining to government is a joint power only, and to be exercised by tribunals." (Pages 85,86)

Dr. Palmer records a most interesting story of one sad occasion when civil and ecclesiastical affairs were confounded by one of the lower courts of the CHURCH. The incident deals with a meeting of the Synod of South Carolina; and is to be found in Palmer's "Life of W. H. Thornwell:"

"Somewhat earlier than the events recorded, during the month of November, 1861, the Synod of South Carolina held its annual session, in the town of Abbeville. Advantage was taken of the presence of gentlemen from different parts of the State to make a declaration upon public affairs. Dr. Thornwell offered the following resolutions, which were adopted

unanimously by the meeting:

'Resolved, 1. By the ministers and elders composing this Synod, not in their ecclesiastical capacity as a court of Jesus Christ, but in their private capacity, as a convention of Christian gentlemen, that our allegiance is due, through the sovereign State to which we belong, and shall be rendered, to the Government of the Confederate States, as long as South Carolina remains in the number.

'Resolved, 2. That the war which the United States are now waging against us, is unjust, and tyrannical, and in contravention of every principle of freedom, which their fathers and ours bled to establish.

'Resolved, 3. That we are firmly persuaded, that the only hope of constitutional liberty, on this Continent, is in the success of the Confederate cause; and we pledge ourselves, and we think we can safely say, the Presbyterian people of these States, to uphold and support the Government, in every lawful measure, to maintain our rights and honor.

'Resolved, 4. That we heartily approve of the appointment, by our President, of next Friday, as a day of fasting, humiliation and prayer.' " (Pages 509, 510)

Thus did the Synod of South Carolina pass its "Gardiner Spring Resolution" in an unofficial manner ! It is almost inconceivable that such an action should be taken against the background of the Philadelphia Assembly of 1861. Of course,

the members of the Synod were perfectly sincere in understanding the transaction to have been effected by themselves as citizens, not a representatives of the Church Court.

To add to the complications, the Resolution was inscribed on the Minutes of Synod; so that the ASSEMBLY of 1862 took exception to these minutes. An explanation was then entered before the Assembly to show how the mistake came about.

Too easily may theoretical distinctions be merged in practical usage, in such a manner as to confuse that which should be kept separate. Right noble were the words of Bishop Collins Denny, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, when during the heat of the 1928 Presidential Campaign, he said:

"Confronted by the inability satisfactorily to determine in very many instances whether my duty as preacher or citizen should prevail, I try to put first and to keep first the fact that by divine appointment I am separated unto the Gospel of God. If I must make a mistake, may God forgive my clouded mind, I prefer to err in favor of the separated life." (Richmond "News-Leader"-July 18, 1928-1)

The words of Andrew Melville, addressed to "God's Sillie Vassal, might well be echoed in expressing the teaching of the CHURCH in regard to provinces of Caesar and of the Church of God: "I maun tell you, there are twa kings and twa kingdoms."

This idea of the separation of the civil and spiritual powers is no novel one in the history of the Presbyterian Church. The re-discoverer of our system of Church Government

has written:

"But, on the other hand, it is also worth while to examine what was the true and ancient use of the jurisdiction of the Church, and what a great abuse of it has been introduced; that we may know what ought to be abrogated, and what ought to be restored from antiquity, if we would overturn the reign of the Antichrist, and reestablish the true kingdom of Christ. in the first place, the object to be secured is the prevention of offences, or the abolition of that which may have arisen. In the use of it, two things require to be considered; first, that this spiritual power be entirely separated from the power of the sword." ("Institutes"-Book IV, Chap. XI, Sec. V)

Calvin, as has been observed, had a strange sort of scheme in which the forces of the State were to come to the aid of the Spiritual Authorities, for the purpose of enforcing ecclesiastical discipline. This, however, was not a consequence of mixing the Churchly and Civil powers. As Taylor Innes has said:

"It was not caused by any such confusion between civil and spiritual government. They were kept theoretically distinct, but the office of the magistrate, though distinct, was held to have nearly the same scope and detail as that of the other." ("Church and State"-141)

In the days of Knox "the question of the separation of Church and State did not arise," says Hector Macpherson. ("Scotland's Battles for Spiritual Independence"-238. Religious

affairs seems naturally to resolve themselves into the form of a National Church, when taken over from the control of the Roman Catholics. (An interesting comment upon the interrelations of the religious and political ideas of the Scotch, by a Southern Presbyterian, is to be found in an article by Rev. Professor Thornton Whaling, Professor of Systematic Theology at Louisville Theological Seminary, one of the four Theological Colleges of the CHURCH. In a discussion of "The Making of Woodrow Wilson, Dr. Whaling, having grounded the traits of the late ex-President in the training and thinking of his Scotch forebears, quotes from Dr. Stalker's work, "John Knox and His Ideals," the statement concerning the remaker of Scotland: "Only less important to his native land and to his religious views were the Scotch Reformers' political opinions. To himself the two appeared to be one, and ever since in the Scottish mind the waters of religious and political connection have been in close proximity, with a constant tendency to mingle." These words are followed by Professor Thornwell's remark: "The Scotch are religious and political; and they do not distinguish between the two; their religious and political systems are akin." ("Union Seminary Review"-Oct. 1925-39))

The present-day bulletin board, which is to be found at the entrance of all Parish Churches in Scotland, strikes the eye of the American visitor as unusual, and inspires in his heart a feeling that such an article in conjunction with the Church is not in accord with the eternal fitness of things. Such a reaction is to be traced to the unconscious training of years spent in a land where the State and Church have generally met only in the most formal of manners, and most frequently have viewed each other as the utmost strangers.

In the days of the Commonwealth, Gillespie appears to have been inspired by the program of Calvin, as he writes:

"My second distinction shall be this: Magistrates may and ought not only to conserve justice, peace and order in the Commonwealth, and in the Church, as it is in the Commonwealth, but also to take special care of the conservation of the true Reformed Religion, and of the Reformation of it when and wherever it needeth to be reformed." ("Aaron's Rod Blossoming"-262)

So apparently with the Westminster Fathers of the same generation: "The civil magistrate...yet he hath authority, and it is his duty, to take order, that...the truth of God be kept pure and entire, etc." (British "Confession of Faith"-Chap. XXIII-Sec. 3)

The present situation in Scotland concerning the Union, is one that it is difficult for the Southern Presbyterian to grasp. Perhaps, after all, such an understanding is unnecessary at the present time, and light will come with the realization of that which has been the dream of many for the decade past.

Writing in a "Concise History of the Presbyterian Church," a former Stated-Clerk of the U. S. A. Assembly declares:

"To the Presbyterian Church must be ~~the honor~~ ^{be} given of the first definite statement, by an organized body on American soil, of what is today recognized as the distinctively American and true doctrine of the right relation between Church and State. That relation is expressed in the clear-cut statement, 'A free Church

in a free State." (24) The interpretation to be placed upon such a statement as this, however, varies widely as between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches; so it is really in the application of principle that we are to distinguish the positions of the two bodies.

It is with this that we approach the crux of the whole question, that is, insofar as the Presbyterian Churches of the United States are concerned--What attitude shall the Church take toward affairs political? To what extent shall the Church enter into that realm which is usually regarded as pertaining to the State? How shall the theory of separation be applied to the life of the Church when she is tempted to take a hand in civil affairs?

The answer of the Southern Presbyterian Church is unflinching. "The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State," asserts the "Address to the Churches" (Par. 5) The Report of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence of the year 1866, as adopted by the Assembly, presents the matter:

"Upon no one subject is the mind of this Assembly more clearly ascertained, upon no one doctrine is there a more solid or perfect agreement amongst those whom this Assembly represents, than the non-secular and non-political character of the Church of Jesus Christ."

(AM-1866-30)

A resolution passed in 1892, in answer to an appeal from the New Hebrides Mission Synod, concerning the importation of

liquor and firearms into these islands, declares: "The Church has no right to interfere with, or attempt to control, the civil policy of the State." (AM-1892-457) In the Minutes of the Assembly of 1897 (17) is recorded the reply to a petition from the Prohibition Party of North Carolina, which reads in part: "by uniform practice and constitution we are forbidden to intermeddle with political parties or questions."

During the stress of the Spanish-American War of 1898, we hear the Assembly ringing true to tradition:

"Yet it is the duty of ministers to proclaim from their pulpits at all times nothing but 'the glorious gospel of the blessed God,' according to the Church's commission from her sovereign Head, Jesus Christ, the Lord." (AM-1898-222)

With these sentiments concur the composite voice of the leaders of the Church. Dr. J. A. Lyon (1863), in the "Southern Presbyterian Review" of April, 1863, writing under the title, "Religion and Politics," says:

"In the first place, it is very clear, from what has been said relative to the true nature and design of the organized Church, that, as such, it has no right or authority to administer civil government, or to participate in any respect whatever in purely secular affairs."

Another of the stalwarts of those early days, J. A. Wadell, contributes the following to the discussion:

"In the Presbyterian Church Assembly, the members are both Christians and citizens. Their individual feelings

and opinions on political questions have their proper sphere in the outside world. With them they have nothing to do whilst engaged in their spiritual offices. They transcend their commission whenever they undertake to decide questions that belong to political life." (SER-April, 1883)

"Lectures on Sacred Rhetoric" (R. L. Dabney) deals with such activities somewhat at length, in regard to that phase which manifests itself from the pulpit:

"The scriptural doctrine of the preacher's mission and warrant also decides at once against any abuse of the pulpit, to which the clergy have always been prone. It may be named with sufficient accuracy by the popular phrase, 'political preaching.' " (40)

Another Theological Professor, Dr. R. A. Webb, of Louisville Seminary, touches upon the theme in his posthumous work, "Christian Salvation--Its Doctrine and Experience:"

"The spirituality of the kingdom of Christ deeply and radically separates it from the kingdom of Caesar, and Caesarism in the church is as deplorable as ecclesiasticism in the state." (239)

The successor of Dr. Dabney, in the Chair of Systematic Theology in Union Seminary (Virginia), adds: "If the church does a political act, it is guilty of a usurpation of the prerogatives of the state." ("Miscellaneous of T. E. Peck, D. D., LL. D."-287)

When we turn to compare the situation in other lands with that in America, in regard of the intrusion of the Church into the affairs of the State, we are at once struck with the dissimilarity of the issues involved; for the opportunities of the Presbyterian Church to regulate civil affairs elsewhere have been extremely limited. The struggle has usually taken the form of a fight on the part of the Church to prevent the State from encroaching upon the ecclesiastical sphere; little strength or time has remained for the contest to assume the opposite aspect.

The fundamental principles upon which the civil government of the United States was founded have contributed greatly to the solution of the problem of the relation of the Church and State. When the political declaration is made: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (Declaration of Independence--Par. 2)"; it becomes evident that many of the problems encountered in the history of British and European Churches are thereby anticipated and, to a great degree, eliminated. Such political philosophy must have a profound effect upon the rights and privileges accorded churches and worshippers under the government founded upon such premises.

Such doctrine as this could not endure that one-time condition in Scottish affairs, when the good Catholic Mary was charged with the purgation of what she considered to be the es-

essential elements of the religion of the land. Imposition of creeds upon a church by Parliament or Congress could find no place, logically, at any rate, in the scheme of affairs established upon such a tenet.

The Constitution, likewise, provides for religious freedom for those of all faiths (Amendments-Article I). In accord with this the several States took their own courses in working out the matter for themselves, and, during this time, certain strange situations were created. Nevertheless the inevitable Presbyterian and American idea of separation finally emerged in the form of a practical working plan for the solution of a much discussed and oft mistaken question.

While the laws of the different States vary in regard to the matter of the recognition of religious liberty--even as they do as to the number of miles per hour a motor vehicle may be legally driven over the highways, and as to whether or not the windows of a railway car passing through the State shall be required to be screened or such screens forbidden by law--the general principle is always in evidence. In the words of Dr. William Henry Roberts:

"In harmony with these requirements (those of the Federal Constitution) religious liberty is acknowledged in one way or another, as the indefeasable right of man in the Constitution of all the States." ("Laws Relating to Religious Corporations"-Page vii)

In the same volume, Dr Roberts calls attention to the rather curious heritage of one of the New England States:

"The only State whose Constitution appears to favor State aid in connection with religious worship is that of New Hampshire." (Page viii)

Possibly at no other point has a provision of the Constitution had a more salutary effect upon the thinking of the citizenry. In present-day America the idea of an alliance between Church and State is never dreamed of, save when a Roman Catholic aspires to the Presidency or some other high office in the land.

On the other hand, a striking example of how unexpectedly the question of the relation of Church and State may arise, is to be found in a recent incident which took place on the floor of the United States Senate.

While a bill for the construction of battle cruisers was before that body, Senator Heflin, of Alabama, offered an amendment designed to prevent the flying of the Church Pennant above the National Flag, such as is customary while divine services are being held on ship-board. When the matter was put to a vote, a number of Senators called for an expression on the religious issue which they conceived to have been raised thereby.

Senator Tydings, after a rather sarcastic remark on the Amendment, added:

"I hope we will settle this question today and now for all time. I hope we will put our God ahead of our country. If that be unpatriotic then make the most of it." (A. P. Dispatch to "Johnson City Chronicle"-Feb. 6, 1929--Page 1)

It must be confessed that such words ring rather strangely upon the ear of those who have grown accustomed to the usual nature and form of comment to be heard upon the floor of the Senior Legislative Body. The whole proceeding goes to show that, even in these United States, the question of Spirituality may arise under the most unexpected circumstances and in the most unthought of places.

The heart of the matter has been reached; for we now must compare the attitudes of the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches toward the problem of the entrance of the Church into the province of the State. How far shall the Church go into the field of political affairs? What are to be her guiding principles in such actions?

In practice the contrast may well be stated by saying that the Southern Church will have nothing to do with a question that is political. It may be that the issue is a moral one, but with a political problem, as such, the Presbyterian Church in the United States will not concern itself (Exceptions to this are noted in Chapter Seven). On the other hand, the Northern Church will pursue a moral issue into the field of politics (Instances of this are given in Chapter Six).

The Moderator of the 1928 General Assembly of the U. S. A. Church, Dr. Hugh K. Walker, writing in his official capacity as Moderator of the Assembly, for the official organ of that Church, "The Presbyterian Magazine," issued an appeal to the voters of his communion to support Herbert Hoover for the office of President of the United States. The article was re-

produced in the "New York Times" of September 22, 1928, from which the following excerpts are taken:

"It is not only our privilege but our plain duty to speak our minds on questions affecting the moral interests and welfare of mankind. No fear of criticism from friend or foe should prevent us from performing this plain duty. We might, of course, waive the privilege, but we do not do otherwise than speak out, now that the issue is unmistakably drawn. The old bogey about 'the church in politics' need frighten us no more. The scarecrow about the 'union of Church and State' flutters harmlessly in the wind today. All such fine spun sophistries should be referred to Will Rogers and his 'Anti-Bunk Party' for their merciful consideration."

Touching upon the Prohibition Question, he continues:

"What folly, amounting to absurdity, to ask churchmen and ministers of the Gospel to keep silent now on the moral issue which they originated and projected and propagated merely because it has been taken up as a political issue by the two great contending parties."

But the Moderator is not content to confine his attention to this moral issue; for, speaking of Hoover, he says:

"Outside of his stand on prohibition, this candidate has so many admirable qualities and has rendered such splendid service to humanity in war and in peace that many believe him to be the peer of any man ever nominated for the highest office in the gift of the Republic."

"The plain duty of every churchman is to work and pray and vote for the election of Herbert Hoover."

What more could be said ! Thus writes the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America in the year of Grace 1928. Naturally the article brought forth violent pretexts from leaders of the communion represented by Dr. Walker. It is difficult to believe that such a political document could have been perpetrated on the Northern Church in the manner of this published editorial in the official magazine of the Church.

Since the writing of the foregoing, Dr. Walker has entered a two-fold explanation of the editorial.

In the first place, he states that the topic of prohibition was treated only in response to a telegram from the Editor of "The Presbyterian Magazine;" and that the article thereon displaced an editorial on "Young People's Work," which he had previously forwarded to that publication.

"I would not," he says, "have presumed to have volunteered to express an opinion on the Presidential campaign. I never mention such things in my own pulpit."

The Moderator then explains that his article was intended as an "interpretation" of the action of the General Assembly of 1928, in which that body "called upon all political parties to include in their platform declarations in support of the Eighteenth Amendment and all supporting Federal and State legislation and to nominate candidates who are openly committed to effective prohibition enforcement by their utterances, acts

and records. ' " --all of which furnishes an excellent illustration of the troubles which flow from the attempt of any church to take a hand in the conduct of the affairs of the State.

("New York Times"-Nov. 5, 1928) .

The end of this section cannot be marked better than by the words of Dr. R. C. Reed (1922), as he writes of his Church, in a "History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World:"

"The church stresses the principle that 'Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical, and are not to intermeddle with civil affairs.' Interpreting this with rigid literalness, the church excludes from its courts all discussion of political questions, and refuses alliance with any organization that aims merely at social or political reform." (Page 287)

The State and the Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Church

We judge that the Church has neither the warrant nor the right to meddle in the affairs that belong to the realm of politics. To the converse of this proposition we shall now devote our attention--Shall the State take a hand in the management of the purely churchly affairs of the Church?

Beginning, as is our custom, with the "Address to the Churches," we read "...the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church." (Par.5) Five years later, in 1866, an adopted report of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence declares:

"The early assertion of this radical distinction, at the very opening of our history, commits us to the maintainence and defence of the crown rights of the Redeemer, whether, on the one hand, they be usurped by the State, or whether, on the other, they be renounced by any portion of God's professing people."

(AM-1866-30)

On Page 13 of the Minutes of the same year, it is taught that:

"Christ alone is King and Head of His Church, and that all ordinances of worship binding on us are ordained by Him alone: that there are two commonwealths, equally appointed by God..." (AM-1866-13)

The teachings of the Fathers of the CHURCH harmonize with the precepts of the ASSEMBLY:

"The powers of the civil magistrate then, are limited by righteousness, (not always by facts) to these general functions, regulating and adjudicating all secular rights, and protecting all members of civil society in their enjoyment of their several proper shares thereof." (Dabney-"Theology"-869)

E. C. Gordon, in the "Union Seminary Magazine" of Oct.-Nov., 1911, remarks: "The State is not to dictate the policy of the Church, nor to support it." W. C. Clark ("Presbyterian Quarterly"-Jan., 1900) holds:

"The State should seek nothing from the Church, but that beneficent influence which she can best exert by keeping within her own sphere and doing the work of her own King."

Dr. A. Mitchell Hunter, in his "Teaching of Calvin," has a chapter entitled, "Church and State." "Calvin," says Dr. Hunter, "demanded that the Church should exercise its purely spiritual functions unhindered, unhampered, and uncensored by the State." (189) He continues:

"In Calvin's view however, Church and State have an intimate relationship, which might roughly be described as of the nature of two intersecting circles. They serve the same ends and both hold divine commissions....Church and State can as little do without one another as body can do without soul or soul without body. But the Church should brook neither interference nor dictation from the State in things spiritual. Its creed was a matter for its own decision, though the State might afterwards confer its imprimatur without right of review, so formally bestowing upon it legal recognition and status. The Church claimed autonomy²¹ in the exercise of discipline and the imposition of ecclesiastical penalties in accordance with the laws of its constitution, also without review on the part of the State. Within these provinces it was self-governing, acknowledging no earthly master and bowing to the behests of no worldly authority." (189)

Of course, the actual relation of the State to the Church in the city of Geneva was a far different thing. In practice the State exercised a very decided control over the Church; but this was simply because Calvin was not able to prevail upon

the authorities to put his plans and ideas into operation.

Again, the whole story of Establishment is one in which a contrary doctrine of that of the Southern Presbyterian Church was put into practice. The ways in which this principle of the CHURCH has been contravened in the history of the Presbyterian Churches of the world are legion.

The latest phase of the situation in the Scottish Church which strikes an unharmonious chord in the spirit of the teachings of the Presbyterian Church in the United States is the note to be found in ~~"The Charter of Union"~~ "The Charter of Union", relative to the attendance of the King, or his Commissioner, upon the sessions of the Assembly of the United Church. The CHURCH would, doubtless, take great pleasure in welcoming the President of the United States to a meeting of its Assembly--be he Episcopalian or the adherent of another faith--but it would never be moved to incorporate an expression of such welcome in the Standards of the Church. Furthermore, the use of the word "loyally" in that article of the ~~"Pact"~~ "Pact" which covers this proposition, is not in keeping with the ideas of the Southern Church, as regards the function of the ASSEMBLY. The ASSEMBLY, as such, knows only one Sovereign to whom her allegiance is due; and He dwells not in houses made with men's hands.

It will be interesting for Americans to note the manner in which British Churches (Presbyterians) interpret those passages of the "Confession" which deal with the sphere of the civil magistrate in the religious realm (It has already been noted that Americans solved the problem by revising the Confession in such a manner as to eliminate the troublesome sections).

Thus the "Declaratory Act of 1879" of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland:

"5. That in regard to the doctrine of the civil magistrate, and his authority and duty in the sphere of religion, as taught in the Standards, this church holds that the Lord Jesus Christ is the only King and Head of the Church, and 'Head of all things to the Church, which is His body,' disapproves all compulsory or persecuting and intolerant principles in religion; and declares, as hitherto, that she does not require approval of anything in her Standards

that teaches, or may be supposed to teach, such principles." (The bare records of several occasions on which such expedients have been resorted to are found in "U. F. C. of Scotland--No. XXXII")

It is instructive to note that the Presbyterian Churches of the whole world are coming more and more to the American Idea of the non-interference of the State in the affairs of the Church. This has been especially evident in the history of the Church in Scotland in recent years; while it appears inevitable that the future will see ~~some~~ ~~movement~~ continue until the last vestige of State control has been removed from the Presbyterian family.

III The Proper Relation of Church and State

When all has been said as to the necessity and desirability of the separation of the affairs of Caesar and the things of God, the fact remains that there are times and circumstances when, and under which, the Church and State must meet. The

"two distinct commonwealths" hold sway, in part, at least, over the same subjects; and this fact compels us to recognize the impossibility of consigning the Church to one compartment of life and the State to another, without provision for the inevitable meeting of the two in the practical working out of the problems of the two governments. Since there is, therefore, both by ordination and necessity, a relation between the two, what shall this relation be? We have rejected the idea of the State-dominated Church and that of the Church-controlled State. Fortunately, there remains a third possible relation.

At the first meeting of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY, in 1861, an effort was made to secure from the Confederate Government the civil authority for the holding of property in trust by the CHURCH. It became apparent that there was no power in the Government of the Confederate States ~~from which~~ such a charter might be obtained (The ASSEMBLY was subsequently incorporated under the laws of the State of North Carolina). In this incident we have an illustration of the fact that the Church recognized that it should comply with the civil regulations regarding the holding of property and like matters.

In the "Address to the Churches," notice is likewise taken of the authority over the Church under circumstances connected with religious sects which may prove harmful to the peace or detrimental to the government: "...In like manner, if the Church becomes seditious and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance."

To quote once more from the article by Dr. Nourse ("Presbyterian Quarterly"-Jan. 1897-42): "The church knows the state to

render obédience to her as the power ordained of God for a specific purpose."

A summary of the legal aspect of this question, as represented in and by the civil law of the United States, and concurred in by the Protestant Churches of America, has been compiled by Mr. Taylor Innes, in his work, "Church and State."

His compilation follows:

"1. American law acknowledges a voluntary jurisdiction in the Church; leaves all church questions (of worship, doctrine, discipline, and membership) to the decision of the Church itself; and refuses to review these decisions. But

"2. It claims for itself complete and exclusive control, not only over the life, liberty, and goods of all men and churchmen, but over all church property and church funds.

"3. In order to decide these purely civil questions of person, goods, and estate, the law necessarily deals with innumerable religious questions and church relations.

"4. Where such civil question (of property or money) turns upon an express trust, American law inquires for itself into the fulfilment of the conditions of that trust (whether these be religious or ecclesiastical) to the uttermost, and it enforces the trust to the effect of settling the question of property, but to that effect only. It never replaces a church member or official, or interferes with inter-

nal organization or administration.

"5. When property is held by a church generally, or for church purposes, unspecified (and not on an express trust, as for the maintenance of certain doctrines or government), American law presumes, in questions as to that property, that the administration of church matters by the Church, and the decisions of church questions by its tribunals, are right; and in one such case the Supreme Court of the United States has also announced that it will hold the decision of the Church (by its majorities or judicatories) to be not only right, but conclusive, upon the Church question, and will regulate the civil question of property which may depend upon it accordingly." (199, 200)

We may express this phase of the question: "The Southern Presbyterian Church holds that the Church is to respect the laws of the civil government in regard to property and such kindred matters as come within the jurisdiction of the State.

The Churchman and the Civil Government

The churchman lives under the laws of that land in which he makes his home. How shall he regard these laws? The Great teacher, in the days of his flesh, insisted that his followers observe the statutes of Caesar. Those who assumed the lead in the early days of the Christian Church echoed his doctrine, when they wrote: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers;"—"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and

powers, to obey magistrates;"-"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake;"-"Fear God;honor the king."

"If Caesar is your master," runs the"Address to the Churches," "then pay tribute to him." (Par.5) The dark and stormy days of the second year of the War brought forth this declarations "We distinctly recognize the right of the State to claim the services of any or all her citizens in this the time of her need." (AM-1862-19)

So important and illustrative of the position of the CHURCH is a pastoral letter issued by the ASSEMBLY of 1865, that a somewhat extended extract from that message is reproduced:

"1. Our relation to the Civil Government of the Country--The Storm of war has, during the four years past, swept over nearly every part of our bounds; a war so devastating proportions, so bitter in its animosity, so desolating in its effects, as to make it an astonishment to the nations. Its sacrifice in treasure and in blood, its public losses and private griefs, swell beyond all calculation. As to its particular causes, or upon which party rests the blame, chiefly or wholly--these are questions which the Church of Christ has no commission to decide.

During the prevalence of this war "the higher powers" actually bearing rule over the most of our bounds, and to which under the word of God we were required to be "subject" were the Government of the Confederate States, and those of the several States constituting it. By the event of the war, the first

has been overthrown, and the second, as constituents thereof are changed. "Higher Powers" now bearing rule over us, are confessedly the Government of the United States, and those existing in the States wherein we reside. The rightfulness of these several authorities, or to which of them the allegiance of our people, as citizens, was, or is primarily due, are matters upon which the jurisdiction of the Church has no right to pronounce judgment. The relation of the Church of Christ to civil government is not only *de jure* but *de facto*. As right and good, or wrong and wicked, they rise and fall by the agency or permission of God's providence. In either case, the attitude of the Church toward them is essentially the same. As long as they stand and are acknowledged, obedience is to be enjoined as a duty, factious resistance condemned as a sin. But in regard to the conflict between existing governments, or as to movements in society, peaceful or otherwise, to effect political changes, the Church as such has no more control over them than it has over the polls of the country. If it has authority to uphold on the one side, it has equal power to condemn on the other; if to suppress a political government, then also to instigate it. In truth it has neither; and to assert the contrary is to corrupt the Church in its principles, forever to embroil it with the strifes of the world, and plunge it headlong into ruin.

"Under these views, and considering the extraordinary conflict through which the country has passed, as well as the extraordinary circumstances in which it is now placed; it is incumbent upon us to exhort you, brethren, to "obey them that have the rule over you and to submit yourselves." Fulfil with scrupulous fidelity all your obligations to the government of the land; remembering the duty of this compliance, "Not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake" "for so is the will of God, that with well doing you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men." (AM 1865-382)

A deliverance of the Assembly of 1899 bears upon the matter of the churchman and the laws of his land. Relative to the practice of groups of men taking the law into their own hands in dealing with the violators of the chastity of women, the following was adopted:

"The General Assembly takes occasion to express its strongest condemnation of the lawless spirit abroad in the land manifesting itself in many ways, but notably in scenes of mob violence and the taking of human life, in cases of supposed or proven crime, without due process of law, involving the awful danger of inflicting death upon an innocent person, while the real criminal goes free; tending also to cheapen human life, to unsettle the social order, and to weaken or destroy the reverence for law and constituted authority which the Scriptures require all to uphold.

"We, therefore, while expressing our abhorrence of the crimes that lead to the disorders referred to, urge all our people and ministers, in all Scriptural ways, to do their utmost towards cultivating and maintaining that order and reverence for authority which are enjoined by the Word of God." (AM-1899-491)

A similar strain was sounded in 1920, when it was resolved:

"That the Presbyterian Church in the United States, speaking through this Assembly, renews its witness against every disobedience to established law and all disregard of constituted authority; that it lifts its voice against the destructive iniquity of covetousness in its many and insidious forms; and that it would, in this deliverance, lift before all the people the Bible standard of right doing as the only measure of conduct that it urges upon all, especially the rulers of mankind, the principles of the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the only safe guide to the solution of the world problems; that it calls upon its preachers and teachers incessantly to lift up this standard and urge these principles; and that it livingly enjoins its own constituency in particular, in loyal devotion to them, to show among all the people examples of good citizenship and righteousness, observing every right law, hating covetousness, and walking humbly with the Lord." (AM-1920-74)

What say the doctors of the CHURCH in regard to obedience to lawful civil authority? Dr. Russell Cecil, in his "Handbook of Theology," writes:

"It must not be forgotten, however, that the State, as well as the Church, is a divine institution. 'The powers that be are ordained of God;' The ruler 'is a minister of God to thee for good;' 'For this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God' (Romans 13:1,4,6). The Church, therefore, should not forget the exhortation of the apostle Paul, 'I exhort, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgiving be made for all men; for kings and for all that are in high places: that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity' (1 Timothy 2:1-2)." (92)

The "Union Seminary Review" of December-January, 1913-14 contains the following from the pen of Dr. J. S. Lyons (1913):

"Shall the Church and the preachers take an active hand officially in business and politics and other secular activities about them? By no means. The power is to come through the Spirit of Christ as manifested in the holy living of his people in every situation of life, as it is wisely directed to bring its heavenly light and power to the solution of life's sore problems. The Church will not be going over bodily into politics, but it will be sending an ever increasing multitude of people into business, society and politics,

who have been instructed and inspired by her teaching and ordinances, and who will trade, and talk, and vote, and act as before God, and to His glory." (Page 75)

Verily the words of one who is imbued with the Calvinistic idea of God! There is a striking similarity between the teaching of Dr. Lyons and the declaration of Thomas Chalmers:

"We hold that every department of Government should be leavened with Christianity, and every functionary in it, from the highest to the lowest, should be under its influence." ('Witness' Newspaper, 19th May, 1843--Quoted from Barr, "Scottish Church Question")

The Right of Revolution

A peculiar angle of the question under discussion is that of the right of Revolution. Do such doctrines as we have just presented positively forbid the participation of Christian people in any such movements in society? If not, under what circumstances is Revolution justifiable?

Attention should be directed to a portion of the Pastoral Letter of 1865, which has been given at an earlier point in this chapter:

"The relation of the Church of Christ to civil government is not only de jure but de facto....As long as they stand and are acknowledged, obedience is to be enjoined as a duty, factious resistance condemned as a sin. But in regard to the conflict between existing governments, or as to movements in society, peace-

ful or otherwise, to effect political changes, the Church as such has no more control over them than it has over the polls of the country." (AM-1865-382)

Dr. R. L. Dabney ("Theology"-871,872) treats the matter at considerable length, all the while, of course, with a mind reminiscent of the war through which he and his Church had so recently passed. He first disposes of the argument for passive obedience from Romans 13, by remarking that the divine authority does not necessitate a particular form of government, but rather submission to the government whatever it is.

How shall a government which has ceased to serve its proper ends be changed? By external interference? Surely not. The movement must come from within. The solution of the problem is to be found in the movement of the individual as he reflects the movement of the popular heart, as he rises to throw off the rule that has utterly failed to do those things for which it was intended. This calls to mind "^LRex, ^RLex," the author of which was likewise living under the shadow of a mighty revolution among Anglo-Saxon Peoples.

Dr. A. A. Hodge ("Commentary on Confession of Faith"-406, 407) interprets the Confession as permitting revolution:

"When the civil government has become so radically and incurably corrupt that it has ceased to accomplish the ends for which it was established." "When this point has unquestionably been reached, when all means of redress have been exhausted without avail, when there appears no prospect of securing reform in the government

itself, and some good prospect of securing it by revolution, then it is the privilege and duty of a Christian people to change their government--peacefully if they may, forcibly if they must"--precisely the position--rightly or wrongly--taken by the South (The Cotton States) at the beginning of the American Civil War. (Dr. Hodge was, of course, a minister and teacher of the Northern wing of the Presbyterian Church)

Nor have Southern Presbyterians been backward in the initiation of efforts to throw off rule which they considered to be unworthy of rightful obedience. The story of the Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence is a record of the deeds of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of the South, in its entirety. From "Foot's Sketches of North Carolina" we glean the details of the facts in this connection.

Briefly summarized, they are: On the 20th day of May, 1775, a body of North Carolina farmers met at Charlotte, North Carolina. Of the assembly of twenty-seven men who adopted the Declaration, nine were elders in the Presbyterian Churches of that section, and a tenth was a Presbyterian minister, Rev. Hezekiah Balch. This Declaration asserted:

"That we the citizens of Mecklenburg County, do hereby dissolve the political bonds which have connected us with the mother country, and hereby absolve ourselves from all allegiance to the British crown." ("Foot's Sketches of North Carolina"--38)

Something of the significance of this action is to be gained

from a realization of the fact that, at this time, neither Washington nor Jefferson appear to have dreamed of independence. Furthermore, a pastoral letter issued by the General Synod of 1775, and dated two days later than the action of the Mecklenburg Presbyterians, is emphatic in its declaration of allegiance to the King:

"First. In carrying out this important struggle, let every opportunity be taken to express your attachment and respect to our sovereign, King George, and to the revolution principles by which his august family was seated on the British throne." ("Minutes of the Synod of New York and Philadelphia"-1775-466ff)

At the end of this letter is a record: "Mr. Halsey dissents from that paragraph of said letter which contains declarations of allegiance." Thus we see that while one member of the Synod protested against the idea of allegiance to the crown, the Presbyterian farmers of Carolina were led to declare their independence of Britain--all this more than a year before the adoption of the National Declaration of Independence.

Neither is this idea of the Christian's duty to yield obedience to his civil rulers a new discovery of the CHURCH. Peter and Paul, as we have seen, taught such obedience as the duty of Believers. Calvin writes:

"Hence follows another duty, that, with minds disposed to honor and reverence magistrates, subjects approve their obedience to them, in submitting to their edicts, in paying taxes, in discharging public duties, and

bearing burdens which relate to the common defence, and in fulfilling all their commands." ("Institutes"-Book IV-Chapter XX-XXIII)

Dick explains:

"When we affirm that the power of the church is not derived from the state, or dependent upon it, we do not plead for the exemption either of the members, or of the rulers, from civil authority." ("Theology"-504)

The doctrines of the Confession of Faith, of course, binds the various Presbyterian Churches together in their attitude taken toward the civil magistrate in the various lands. Whatever disagreement may exist as to the exact status of the Church toward the magistrate and the civil authorities toward the Church, all are agreed that it is the duty of the members of the Church to respect the earthly rulers and to obey their decrees. (See: "Draft of Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual"-Submitted to Assembly of 1919-VI; "Plan of Union"-art. relative to attendance of King on sessions of the Assembly)

"The Intermediate Catechism" of the U. S. A. Church, adopted in 1912, puts the matter as follows:

Q. "What is our duty to our country?"

A. "Our duty to our country is to love and pray for it, to obey its laws, to secure and sustain worthy officers, and to serve the common good." (AMUSA-1912-101)

The Cedral Statement drawn up by a joint committee, composed of representatives of the CHURCH and the United Presbyterian

Church, and presented to the Assembly of 1928, treats this matter in the following language:

¶33) 'The exclusively spiritual nature of the mission of the Church does not imply that the Church owes no duty to civil society. On the contrary, it is the imperative duty of the Church, through its members as citizens of the civil commonwealth, to apply the principles of Christianity to all the moral, social and industrial conditions of society.' (AM-1928:154; See also AM-1913-23ff)

Civil Laws which are to be Resisted

Are there not, however, circumstances under which "we ought to obey God rather than men?" The answer of the CHURCH to this question is well stated in the "Address:"

"When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them, and humbly petition that they may be repealed." (Par. 5)

A concrete instance of dealing with such matters is furnished by an incident in connection with the Golden Castle School, in Japan, which came before the Assembly of 1921. The action of the Court is self-explanatory:

"In response to overture from the Presbytery of Mecklenburg in regard to the Imperial Rescript and the Constitution of the Golden Castle School for Girls, we recommend that the Executive Committee of Foreign Missions be instructed to investigate and if it be found that the Imperial Rescript does encourage idolatrous

worship or seriously compromises essential Christian truth, then the Executive Committee shall protest against its incorporation in the Constitution of the Golden Castle School for Girls, and take such action as may seem wise and proper." (AM-1921-52)

The same principle is evident in the report of a special Committee of the Assembly to the Assembly of 1905, concerning the remarriage of divorced persons. As adopted by that body, it reads in part:

"To urge upon all ministers:.....

"(b) to exercise the utmost caution in the matter of the remarriage of divorced persons, and to refuse to officiate at the remarriage of any and all such persons, except such as have been divorced upon grounds allowed by the Church to be Scriptural, and then only in the case of the innocent party." (AM-1905-23)

The writer was informed, during the winter of 1926-27, by a minister of the Australian Presbyterian Church, that the custom of that body was for the minister to follow the law of the State. This is positively forbidden by the above deliverance, insofar as the Southern Presbyterian Church is concerned.

Dr. Dabney, in the course of a very sane discussion of the duty of the Christian when confronted with an unrighteous law, sums up the matter:

"If the thing commanded by the civil magistrate is positively sinful, then the Christian citizen must refuse obedience, but yield submission to the penalty thereof." ("Theology"-870)

It is needless to say to those who are familiar with the history of the Presbyterian Churches that this is a common principle, so far as these Churches of the different lands are concerned. Numbers who have counted their lives not dear unto death are standing before us as a testimony of the fact that obedience to "another king, one Jesus," has always been regarded as the only path of duty open to His subjects, when confronted with a contradictory command from any human governor.

Calvin wrote: "If they command anything against him, it ought not to have the least attention." ("Institutes"-Book IV-Chapter XX) So say we all !

IV Liberty of Conscience and Religious Worship

When the Confession of Faith (American) teaches:

"...it is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the Church of our common Lord, without giving preference to any denomination of Christians above the rest.." (XXIII-III),

there appears to be an implication that only Christians are to be allowed to worship under the protection of the civil authorities. The following sentence, however, dissolves any such notion, with the words:

"It is the duty of civil magistrates to protect the person and good name of all their people, in such a manner that no person be suffered, either upon pretence of religion or infidelity, to offer any indignity, violence, abuse or injury to any person whatsoever."

Such is the doctrine to which the CHURCH has held. Upon one notable occasion (See Chapter Seven) an effort was made to prevail upon the Government of the Confederate States to incorporate an article in the Constitution favoring the Christian Religion. This was, however, the act of an individual; and was vigorously opposed by the Assembly.

The CHURCH takes cognizance of the fact that there may arise occasions when it is necessary for the State to quell certain disturbances which may be raised by some church, when the "Address" declares:

"if the Church becomes seditious and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance." (Par. 5)

Dabney ("Theology"-879) remarks that "The State is bound to see that every man enjoys his religious freedom untouched, because the right of religious freedom is a secular, or political right," thus, as was his wont, delving into the philosophy of the matter.

This is the same idea incorporated in Art. I of the "Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America," when the declaration is made:

"Congress shall make no laws respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

As the Assembly of the Northern Church has so aptly asserted, there is no such thing in the United States as Religious Toleration. Toleration is an expression applicable only when, and where, some faith has been exalted to a position of preferment.

Such a condition does not exist in present-day America; so, while we may properly refer to Religious Freedom, Toleration is a misnomer when used to apply to the situation in this country. Establishment was a characteristic of Colonial days; and then toleration was often looked upon as a boon. This land of equal opportunity is one in which no faith is hampered by legal establishment; and none is restricted because of legal disabilities. The Presbyterian Church has long been a champion of the religious rights of man. On this side of the Atlantic it seeks to continue,

"A free Church in a free State."

Our study of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church as taught by the Southern Presbyterian Church has enabled us to discover that:

I. The Church is a Spiritual creation as to its origin, ends, and means of advancement;

II. The Church and State are separate commonwealths; therefore the Church should not intermeddle in the affairs of the State, nor should the State intermeddle in the ecclesiastical affairs of the Church;

III. The principles governing the proper relation between the Church and the State are: (1) The Church is to respect the civil law as regards property and kindred matters; (2) The Church is to insist that its members yield obedience to the laws of the land in which they live; (3) The State is to permit freedom of worship to her citizens.

THE DOCTRINE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE
LIFE OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER FIVE

SPIRITUALITY IN CHURCH UNION AND ECCLESIASTICAL AFFILIATION

The Southern Presbyterian Church has never claimed for herself a monopoly upon the whole of Christian truth. From the moment of her inception, in 1861, to the present day, the communion has always proved ready to recognize other branches of the great Church Visible, and to exchange with them such Christian courtesies and felicitations as times and circumstances will permit.

Nor has she been found unwilling to enter into alliances with the other churches with whom her lot has been cast. In some instances the CHURCH has gone so far as to unite in unreserved organic union with such bodies; but only when it was judged that the faith and practices of these other organizations were practically identical with her own. Such union has been consummated with, the United Synod of the South (1864), the Presbytery of Patapsco (1867), the Alabama Presbytery of the Associate Reformed Church (1867), the Synod of Kentucky (1870), and the Synod of Missouri (1874). Not only was the Principle of Spirituality an important element in union in several of these instances, but in some cases had actually called the body with which union was accomplished into being.

The United Synod of the South joined with the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, the union being under discussion at the Assembly 1863, and formally completed by that court in 1864. While the subject of our study is not recorded as having played any great part in the coming together of the two Churches, the very fact that the union was consummated at such a time is proof positive of the likeness of the ideas

of the participants along the line of the provinces of Church and State. Moreover, it had been the question of that Church's attitude toward slave-holding that had led the United Synod to withdraw from the New-school Presbyterian Church in 1857. (Editor's note: "Alexander's Digest-1887"404) The opening lines of the Plan of Union, "The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of American holding the same system of doctrine and church order....," sufficiently cover the field in which we are interested to enable it to be said that the two parties were at one on the matter of Spirituality. (AM-1864-270)

The case of the Presbytery of Patapsco was similar. This ecclesiastical unit withdrew from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, because of "numerous and persistent violations of the constitution of the Church by the highest courts thereof,"--meaning that the Presbytery took exception to such deliverances as the Gardiner Spring Resolution. In 1867 it was merged with the Southern Presbyterian Church. A memorial, presented by the Presbytery to the Assembly of that year, makes reference to our theme, when it reads, "We hold it to be the imperative obligation of all God's people, according to the will of Christ, the sole King in Zion....." (AM-1867-131ff)

The General Assembly of the Associate Reformed Church having authorized the action, the Alabama Presbytery of that Church was united with the Southern Presbyterian Church in the same year(1867). The testimony borne by the Reformed breth-

ren to the Spirituality of the Church may be exhibited by the ASSEMBLY'S Committee's report, adopted in 1861, which contains the following appreciation:

"To the Associate Reformed Synod of the South, who have several times heretofore conferred with us, and who have so kindly and fraternally greeted us on the present occasion, the Assembly feels drawn with the strongest cords of brotherly love. Theirs is a precious ancestry, who gave a noble testimony for truth, lifting up a glorious banner against error, and battling faithfully for Christ and his crown." (AM-1861-35)

At a later point we read: "Both have the same faith and polity." (Reference above) We see, therefore, that in this instance, also, the common doctrines and practices concerning Spirituality participated in the drawing of the two Christian Peoples into one Church.

Union with the Synod of Kentucky

It is in the case of negotiations with the Synod of Kentucky, however, that the idea of an independent Church in an independent State is most gloriously brought to the fore. The story of the union is saturated with the principles for which the Southern Church had contended, even those upon which she had based her right to come into separate existence as a witness for the truth of God. No skill in inference is necessary to discover the common faith and practice which led the two Churches together; no mastery of assumption is needed to bring the realization that the Spirituality of the Body of Christ was

at the root of the union. It is to be regretted that the records of the formation of that union cannot be treated in an adequate manner, so vividly do they present this truth. We shall, however, endeavor to reproduce so much of the correspondence and public papers as will enable the reader to gain some idea of how these documents treat the topic which forms the basis of this thesis.

A commission from the Synod of Kentucky, consisting of five ministers and three ruling elders, appeared before the Assembly of 1867, which was meeting at Nashville, Tennessee. The Rev. Stuart Robinson, who was to be so signally honored by the Southern Presbyterian Church in later years, acted as spokesman for the group. After all other business had been postponed for the purpose of introducing and hearing these gentlemen, and Dr. Robinson had addressed the Assembly concerning their mission, a committee was appointed, of which Rev. James A. Lyon (1863) was Chairman, to consider the whole matter of union with the Synod of Kentucky. The delegation from that Synod was also requested to meet with this Committee of the Assembly for conference.

(AM-1867-133ff)

The matter was again brought before the Assembly by the report of the Committee, which was unanimously adopted. (AM-1867: 143)

(Sketch of the Synod of Kentucky

Since some understanding of the history of the Synod of Kentucky is necessary to a full appreciation of what took place at this time; in view of the fact that the story of that Synod

is really that of a constituent part of the Southern Presbyterian Church; and, finally, since the struggle in Kentucky was based almost entirely on the Principle of the Spirituality of the Church, a brief account of that Body will be here inserted.

The Synod of the Old-school Presbyterian Church of Kentucky did not join those of the other Southern States which withdrew from the Assembly in 1861. On the other hand, it declared that:

"it adheres with unbroken purpose to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and hereby enjoins upon all its members, and upon all under its control and care, to avoid all divisive and schismatical courses, to cultivate the peace of the Church, and to practice great mutual forbearance."

It is not to be assumed, nevertheless, that all the acts of the Northern Church were thereby approved; for, at the same meeting, the Synod regretted "that part of the action of the Assembly touching the order for a day of prayer," on the grounds that it was "liable to be misconstrued." Moreover, that Court considered the Gardiner Spring Resolution to have dealt with political affairs. Though deploring the ^{lack} wisdom of that act of the Assembly which had resulted in the withdrawal of the Southern Presbyteries, it condemned that movement as without sufficient grounds for justification.

The Assembly of the following year (1862) reproved the Synod for its deliverance concerning the day of prayer and like matters.

In 1864 the Minutes of the General Assembly (USA) were disapproved by the Synod in so far as the deliverances of that Court concerning slavery were concerned. The 1865 Assembly reciprocated by disapproving the Minutes of the Synod for the act of that body in criticizing the deeds of the higher court.

More dissatisfaction with the doings of the Assembly, coupled with declarations of loyalty thereto, characterized the Synod of the same year.

The General Assembly of 1866 issued the so-called "Gurley ipso facto Order," which was designed to eject many members of the Kentucky Synod who had signed a paper known as the "Declaration and Testimony." Of this document Synod had already expressed its official disapproval, but by the narrow margin of 56 to 46. The effort to enforce the provisions of the Gurley Order resulted in chaos; from which two Synods emerged; since those favoring the execution of the Order withdrew to form a new body. Of the 108 ministers in the Synod, 32 contended that the Order be enforced, and constituted the second Synod, which, of course, was recognized by the General Assembly as the true Synod of Kentucky.

The Synod composed of those who had turned a deaf ear to the Gurley Order indulged in similar retorts by declaring that the Assembly (USA) had ceased to be a constitutional General Assembly, but a schismatical and revolutionary body.

(The foregoing record is taken in substance from Dr. Alexander's editorial Summary of the "History of the schism in the Synod of Kentucky"-"Alexander's Digest"-1887-427-429))

Returning from our historical explorations, we shall proceed to examine the Report of the Committee assigned the presentation to the Assembly of the matter of closer relations with the Synod of Kentucky. The communication from that Synod was a lengthy one; for in spite of the employment of the smallest type yet devised for the torture of the eye of man, fifteen pages of a book of large dimensions are required for its reproduction.

The Report, by which the Assembly's Committee introduced the Letter, is not proportionate in length to the epistle. It is, nevertheless, a document weighty with the subject of Spirituality; and, therefore, well worth the attention of the interested student. The Committee must have been composed of ecclesiastical diplomats, so happily did it express concord with the brethren of Kentucky, and yet so skillful was its deliverance in avoiding the stirring up of further difficulties along the same line as had engaged the attention of the Synod.

In its pertinent features the Report reads:

"The letter contains a statement of the doctrines and principles for which this Synod and its Presbyteries have been contending for the last seven years, and lays this statement before the General Assembly as the basis of a covenant upon which this Synod may form an organic union with us. It is, of course, not desired by this Synod that this paper should constitute any part of our doctrinal symbols or our written constitution, these being already established in

such form as the Assembly have, in other cases of union, either formed or proposed, distinctly declared its unwillingness to disturb. Nor is it desired, we presume, by the Synod, that the Assembly should enter into the controversies that have disturbed this body during the past seven years, or pronounce upon them in detail. The desire of the Synod, as we apprehend it, is the very natural and proper desire, to be assured that we are in such substantial agreement with them in the principles and doctrines for which they have been contending, that they will not be likely to have a recurrence of the difficulties from which they have already suffered so much. This agreement the Assembly can declare without any difficulty, since the whole existence of our Church as a separate organization has been an assertion of these principles, and a protest against those acts and doctrines that tend to subvert them.

(Here follow three resolutions: 1. An expression of sympathy with the Synod; 2. The expression of purpose on the part of the Assembly to make no utterance in protest against those acts which have proved so distasteful to the Synod, yet a "sincere concurrence substantially in" the Synod's statement of doctrine and constitutional principles as contained in Part III of the Letter;; 3. That the Letter of the Synod of Kentucky be admitted to record "as a part of the histor-

ical acts and monuments of the Church, by publishing it in the Appendix to the minutes of this Assembly."

(AM-1867-144ff))

(It is rather difficult to determine the exact status accorded the Letter, as above treated, by the CHURCH. The Assembly, in ordering that it be published as "a part of the historical acts and monuments of the Church," has certainly conferred a kind of authority upon the communication. Moreover, the Assembly has declared its "cordial approval of, and sincere concurrence in, the Synod's statement of doctrine and constitutional principles" as contained in the latter part of the Letter. There was evidently an intention to avoid giving definite approval to the Synod's position in regard to the historical incidents enumerated--though doubtless the Assembly might have done so with a whole heart. The whole transaction was of an unusual nature that no one is competent to say just what was really done so far as official sanction by the Assembly was concerned. While such a course might well be justified, the Letter has not been used in compiling the teachings of the CHURCH in Chapter Four of this work.)

Brief Analysis of the Letter of the Synod of Kentucky

- I. Facts relating to the Schism in Kentucky and the desire of that Synod to cooperate with other Presbyterian bodies
- II. Acts of the Old-school General Assembly against which the Synod of Kentucky has protested
- III. 1. Contradiction of errors falsely ascribed to the Synod

2. True statement of the Synod's beliefs concerning:

- (1) "The Doctrine of the Kingship of Christ, and the manner in which Christ executeth the office of a king in His Visible Church"
- (2) "The origin, nature, and functions of Church government, as contrasted with, and related to, the civil government"
- (3) "The powers of the several Courts of the Church, their relations to each other and to the office-bearers and people"
- (4) "The interpretation of our form of government and discipline with reference to the functions, powers, and mutual relations of the Courts of the Church" (AM-1867-178ff)

It was not until 1869 that the union was effected, two years being necessary for the Synod of Kentucky to set her house in order, and bring herself and her constituent Presbyteries to the point of uniting with the Southern Church. (AM-1869-369) As was said in the beginning, the story of these proceedings is one too lengthy and varied to be fully treated in these pages; yet it is one that could not be overlooked in any discussion of the Headship of Christ over the Church, such as engages our attention in these pages.

The union with the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky, taking place in 1870, was productive of more concern over the use of Rouse's Version of the Psalms than of discussion of

the Spirituality of the Church. The ASSEMBLY did, however, through the adopted report of its committee, recognize that "the two bodies are one in doctrine, government and discipline." (AM-1870-521)

This, if not a full consideration of the question of Spirituality, at least bears testimony to the fact that there was no difference in this respect between the teachings and practices of the Churches.

Union with the Synod of Missouri

Although the Synod of Missouri did not come into the Church until five years after her sister from Kentucky had been welcomed into the fold, her story is much the same. Each had clung to the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America until they were practically driven to seek independence or connections elsewhere. It was the notorious "Gurley ipso facto Order" that brought the matter to a crisis in each case. In fact, one of the grounds of protest, incorporated in the Letter of the Synod of Kentucky to the GENERAL ASSEMBLY, concerned the treatment of a minister of the Missouri Synod, Rev. Dr. S. B. McPheeters, of the Pine Street Church, of St. Louis.

It is unnecessary to go into the history of the schism in Missouri, other than to say that it was quite like that in Kentucky.

The Rev. A. P. Forman appeared before the ASSEMBLY of 1867 as a delegate from the Synod of Missouri. His proposals, ultimately looking toward union, were referred to a committee of the Assembly, with instructions to bring in a proper minute for adoption by that Court. (AM-1867-143) This Report smacked

strongly of Spirituality, and reads:

"This Assembly heard with profound interest the communication made by Rev. A. P. Forman on behalf of the Synod of Missouri, and desires to place on record its high appreciation of the principles and conduct of that venerable Synod as set forth by Mr. Forman.

The Assembly expresses its deep sympathy for the brethren in Missouri, both officers and members of the Church, in the great fight of affliction through which they have not yet fully passed, though it is hoped they have successfully encountered the greatest trials to which the great Head of the Church has been pleased to call them.

The Assembly feels entire confidence in the full and cordial attachment of the ministers of the Presbyterian Churches in Missouri, as represented in the Synod, for the principles of doctrine and church order set forth in the time-honored Standards of our Church, and is entirely persuaded that, should that Synod be prepared to form an organic union with this Church, no difficulties could arise owing to discrepancies of opinion on any fundamental or important doctrines of the gospel, or any theories of church government which find a practical expression in our Standards.

As to the future relations of this Synod, the Assembly does not feel prepared to express any opinion, whatever it may desire. But it is due to us and to them to say, that this Assembly cordially sympathizes with the Synod of Missouri, as represented by Mr. Forman, in expressing a longing desire for the day when throughout our land all who agree with us in the great truths of the "gospel of the grace of God," and especially who fully sympathize in our position of a truly spiritual body, ever testifying for the supreme and sole authority of the divine and exalted Head of the Church, shall constitute one organized Christian communion, prepared by the spiritual weapons of her warfare to contend earnestly "for the faith once delivered to the saints," and successful in "casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." (AM-1867-149)

In 1871, a section of the adopted Report of the Committee on Foreign Correspondence resolves:

"2. That the Assembly hereby express its Christian sympathy with the Synod of Missouri in the trials to which it has been subjected during the past as a witnessing Church for Christ's crown and kingdom, and does rejoice in its steadfast faith, success and prosperity" (AM-1871-21)

Further negotiations continued in the same strain, and in 1874 the commissioners from the Presbyteries of the Synod of Missouri were enrolled in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. (AM-1874-479)

This brings us to the end of a consideration of those unions which have been formed between the CHURCH and other Presbyterian bodies. It is not surprising to have found that the principle of the Spirituality of the Church has played an important part in such transactions. With this we turn to find whether or not this is true of those negotiations which did not lead to organic union.

Relations and Negotiations with the U. S. A. Church

That the two branches of the Presbyterian Church which were separated in 1861 should, after the passing of the great war, begin to think of reunion is not surprising. The early date at which such overtures were begun, however, was not to be expected. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, at its meeting in 1868, had acknowledged the separate and independent existence of the Southern Branch of the Church. (The Minutes of the Assembly of this Church (USA) had carried blanks for the ministers of the South who had gone out after the passage of the Gardiner Spring Resolution, in the 1862 Edition) That Court of the following year opened negotiations which, it was hoped, would heal the breach created by the War and those stormy scenes in the Assembly of 1861; and ultimately result in the bringing together again of the whole Church.

The specific resolution, passed in the Assembly of 1870, after the usual Christian salutations, proceeded to remind the Southern Church of the fact that both bodies possessed the same symbols of faith, occupied adjacent, and in many cases common, territory; and expressed the hope that "the day may not be far distant when we may again be united in one great organization that shall cover our whole land and embrace all branches of the Presbyterian Church." (AM-1870-501)

In this same year, however, the Old-school and New-school Churches of the North, which had separated in 1837, came together in organic union. From this newly constituted Assembly a delegation was sent to the meeting of the Southern Assembly, in session in Louisville, Kentucky, to present the matter of union to the Presbyterian Church in the United States. These gentlemen, Drs. J. C. Backus (Moderator of the memorable Assembly of 1861), H. J. Van Dyke, and Hon. W. E. Dodge, addressed the Assembly on the subject of their mission. (AM-1870-516ff) The matter was then referred to the Committee on Foreign Correspondence for an answer.

The Committee's Report began with an expression of confidence that the actions of the Southern Church had not, during the period between 1861 and 1870, assumed an atmosphere of hostility toward the brethren of the North. Then followed a recital of difficulties in the way of cordial correspondence between the two bodies:

"1. Both wings of the now united Assembly during their separate existence before the fusion, did fatally complicate themselves with the State in political utteran-

ces deliberately pronounced year after year, and which, in our judgment, were sad betrayal of the cause and kingdom of our common Lord and Head. We believe it to be solemnly incumbent upon the Northern Presbyterian Church, not with reference to us, but before the Christian world and before our Divine Master and King, to purge itself of this error, and, by public proclamation of the truth, to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus Christ as the alone King in Zion; in default of which the Southern Presbyterian Church, which has already suffered much in maintaining the independence and spirituality of the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth, feels constrained to bear public testimony against this defection of our late associates from the truth. Nor can we, by official correspondence even, consent to blunt the edge of this our testimony concerning the very nature and mission of the Church as a purely spiritual body among men." (AM-1870-528ff)

The three following sections of the answer deal with the manner in which the union between the Old and New School Churches ^{was} effected, the expulsion of members of the Southern Church from the Northern body, and recent accusations made by the Northern against the Southern Church.

The Report concludes by referring to these pronouncements of the U. S. A. Assembly, coupled with the assertion in the most direct English, that "so long as they remain upon record they

are an impassable barrier to official intercourse." The Assembly made the Report of the Committee official by a vote of 83 to 17.

In spite of the unhesitating tone of the Report, the Assembly proceeded to appoint a Committee to confer with a like committee to be appointed by the Northern Assembly upon the matter of the establishment of cordial relations between the courts. (AM-1870-535) The duties of this Committee, however, were apparently not arduous; for the Committee of the other Assembly was dissolved before any action could be taken. (AM-1871-10)

At the same time the Assembly issued a Pastoral Letter to the Churches under its care explaining the ^{steps} ~~action~~ taken in this connection. This communication, after a brief review of the late negotiations with the Northern Church, went on to assert that no blame for obstructions in the way of ecclesiastical fellowship was to be attached to the Southern Assembly:

"The overture from the Northern Assembly was based upon the fatal assumption that mutual grievances existed, in reference to which it became necessary to arbitrate. This assumption is precisely what we cannot truthfully concede. Our records may be searched in vain for a single act of transgression, or a single unfriendly declaration against the Northern Church. We have assumed no attitude of hostility towards it. In not a single case has there been an attempt to wrest from them their church property. In not a single case has there been hesitation in receiving their

members into our communion, upon the face of their credentials, amongst the hundreds who have come to make their home with us since the war. In not one instance has there been exhibited a spirit of retaliation in regard to any of those very measures instituted against ourselves, by the Assembly of 1865 and by subsequent Assemblies." (AM-1870-Paragraph 4 of "Pastoral Letter to the Churches"-537ff)

It is seldom that a religious body can speak in such words of the action of the Church which it represents in the wake of any great division which has taken place, by which that branch of the Church has been separated from another. How much more must have been the restraint of the Southern Assemblies, when we remember that, not only was there a great ecclesiastical disturbance, but the two parts of the nation in which these Churches held sway had been engaged in a bloody war, with all the aggravations that such a struggle between peoples of the same state can assume ! It is a glorious fact that such a minute stands inscribed upon the records of the Supreme Court of the CHURCH. Truly the Spirit of the Prince of Peace must have hovered over the halls of her councils during the first decade of that Church's existence, and breathed a calm upon those deliberations, in holy contrast to the fearful contest which was being waged upon the fields of Southern battles.

In a succeeding paragraph of the Letter our subject is mentioned thus:

"It will thus be seen that in the providence of God the Southern Church has been made the special wit-

ness for the crown and kingdom of our Lord, when both were practically disowned; and upon this very issue she was separated from her old associations." (Par. 8)

Toward the close of the missive, another section stands out in strange contrast to so many of the deliverances of the Northern Church; and, at the same time, indicates an appreciation of Christian fellowship and regard for all those who "in many ships" do "seek one spirit-land:"

"These are the convictions which rule our decision in relation to correspondence with the Northern Church. Their offense with us is that we would not yield to the mistaken conscience which permitted them to bind the Church of our Divine Lord to the wheels of Caesar's chariot. We cannot surrender this testimony for the privilege of sitting within their halls. Regarding them as still part of the visible catholic Church, notwithstanding their defection on this point, we place them where we place all other denominations whom we recognize, though differing from us." (Par. 14)

Nothing further was attempted until the year 1874, when a communication from the Northern Assembly was received, relating to the action of that body taken at its 1873 meeting, held in Baltimore. This letter, a somewhat lengthy one, touches upon the matter in which we are interested as follows:

"Third, With regard to the civil magistrate, and the relation of Church and State, the Assembly deem it

sufficient to call attention to the following statements and principles found in our Standards, to-wit:"

(Here follows a quotation from the "Confession of Faith"

--American--Chapter XXXI, Section IV)

"(2) 'That God alone is Lord of the conscience, and hath left it free from the doctrines and commandments of men, which are in anything contrary to His Word, or beside it in matters of faith or worship.' 'That all church power, whether exercised by the body in general or, in the way of representation, by delegated authority, is only ministerial or declarative.

That is to say, that the Holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith and manners; that no church judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority; and that all their decisions should be founded upon the revealed will of God.' "Form of Government"-Chapter I, Sec. I and VII." (AM-1874-500ff)

All this was followed by a proposal for another conference, to which plan the Southern Assembly gave assent, and appointed representatives thereunto. The meeting resulted in nothing so far as progress was concerned. The Southern delegation held that no definite steps could be taken until the Northern Assembly could:

"see its way clear to say, in a few plain words, to this effect, that these obnoxious things were said and done in times of great excitement, and are to be regretted, and that now, in a calm review, the

imputations cast upon the Southern Church (of schism, heresy, and blasphemy) are disapproved...."(AM-1875-17)

It was in 1882 that the next pertinent occurrence took place. The ASSEMBLY telegraphed the Northern Body, meeting in Springfield, Ill., as follows:

"That, while receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for and withdrawal of all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon, or offensive to, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." (AM-1882-530)

The reply received was far too good to be true, as later events proved:

"The Moderator is instructed to telegraph to the Moderator of the General Assembly in session at Atlanta; that his telegram is received with warm enthusiasm by this Assembly; and, in order to remove all difficulties in the way of that full and formal fraternal correspondence between the two Assemblies, which we are, on our part, prepared to accept, we adopt the following, viz.: Whilst receding from no principle, we do hereby declare our regret for, and withdrawal of, all expressions of our Assembly which may be regarded as reflecting upon or offensive to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and we renew the expression of our warm fraternal regard for all who may compose the

communion, and our readiness to exchange delegates forthwith." (AM-1882-541)

The message, however, was not to be taken at its face value. An unofficial telegram followed from the Moderator of the Northern Assembly in which it was explained that, "in the action now being taken we disclaim any reference to the actions of the preceding Assemblies concerning loyalty and rebellion, but refer only to those concerning schism, heresy and blasphemy."

Strange to say, the Southern Assembly, after a further exchange of telegrams which said little and meant less, agreed to an exchange of delegates for 1883. (AM-1882-552,553)

Although objection to the transactions as outlined above were raised by the Presbytery of South Carolina before the Assembly of 1883 (Other church courts also protested against the action taken), the sending of delegates to the Northern Body was sustained, and the matter was allowed to slumber in an uncertain rest. (AM-1883-22)

An article from the pen of Dr. B. M. Palmer, published in the "Southern Presbyterian Review" of April, 1883, indicates the light in which the matter of union was regarded by the foremost thinker of the CHURCH of that day (Thornwell had been transferred to the Church Invisible within a year after the organization of the Southern Presbyterian Church--August 1, 1862). In the course of its pages we read:

What, then, is the distinctive feature which separates us from the northern Brethren? We profess to hold the same symbols of faith and order; our creed,

our government, our worship is the same; why, then should we not be brought under the same ecclesiastical jurisdiction?.....The true and sufficient answer is, that the two bodies are not at one as to the relation subsisting between the Church and the State. This is the differentiating feature which compels the one to be separate from the other."

Were the Great Orator alive today, it is safe to say that he would find other reasons for the continued separation of the Northern and Southern sections of the American Presbyterian Church--the liberalness of the former in the interpretation of the Doctrinal Standards, variant views of the Negro question, etc.--, but now, as in the decades gone by, the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church stands out as the distinctive characteristic of the Southern Presbyterian Church, and raises itself as a bulwark against any efforts which might be put forth to bring the two communions into one organization.

The question of organic union was brought before the Assembly of 1887, when Rev. R. K. Smoot, D. D., offered a paper asking for the appointment of a special committee to report to the Assembly on the advisability of taking action looking toward such a move. (AM-1887-200) After its adoption the discussion was long and vigorous. Finally a resolution was passed, appointing a special committee to meet with a like body from the Northern Church to discuss the obstacles in the way of such union. This Resolution referred to the adoption of the Deliverance of the two Synods of Missouri on the Spirituality

of the Church by the Assembly of the U. S. A. Church. (AM-1887-222ff) At the next Assembly the Committee on Bills and Overtures announced that:

"after a careful consideration of the report of the Committee of Inquiry, we are unable to discover that the obstacles to organic union heretofore existing between the Northern and Southern General Assemblies have to any considerable extent been removed." (AM-1888-420ff)

In keeping with its usual custom after making such straightforward declarations concerning relations with the Northern Church, the ASSEMBLY appointed a committee to meet with a like committee from the Northern Church, for the purpose of making arrangements for co-operation in the work of the two communions, both at home and abroad. To the High Court of 1889 the Report of this Joint Committee on Co-operation was presented. This ASSEMBLY adopted the Report, and later concurred with the Northern Assembly in making slight alterations in the agreement. (AM-1889-573ff;609;615)

In 1894 a committee was appointed, to which all papers touching upon the subject of union with the U. S. A. Church were referred. The Report of this Committee, as adopted by the ASSEMBLY, reads in part:

"The General Assembly declines to reopen the question of organic union by the appointment of a committee of conference as requested by the said Presbyteries, on the following grounds:

1. The historic difference between the two Assemblies as to the relation of the Church of Christ to civil government." (AM-1894-211)

Later years have added much to the general discussion of the formation of some sort of union with the Northern Church, but have shed no new light on the matter of the Spirituality of the Church. It is fitting to say that in the present day differences between the two Churches the question of Spirituality plays an important part. We quote from an article of recent years as published in the "Union Seminary Review" (Jan. 1918); which, in a summary of reasons in opposition to organic union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, says:

"2. Because of differences as to relation of Church and State. Not those incidents of fifty years ago, about which so much has been said and written. That is ancient history and can easily be forgotten. It's the present-day difference in view of the two Churches on how Church should be related to State that is the difficulty. The well-known difference of attitude of these Churches to the State in their equally earnest opposition to the whiskey traffic is a concrete case in point. Believing that our testimony to the spirituality of the Church would be practically if not entirely lost in case of union, we are constrained to oppose it. " (W. R. Minter)

The question of organic union with the United Presbyterian Church of North America was before the Assembly of 1913. At that time a "Suggested Basis of Union", previously drawn up by a joint committee of the two denominations, was presented to the Assembly. Although the proposed union never materialized, it is interesting to note what was said in the plan as to the Spirituality of the Church:

"(2) The exclusive spiritual character of the Church's mission. The union is based on the statement of our common Confession of Faith, viz.: 'Synods and Councils are to handle or conclude nothing but that which is ecclesiastical....(Here follows the remainder of this section of the "Confession")' "

(AM-1913-23ff)

In 1928 a similar report to the ASSEMBLY was made by a committee on Closer Relations with the United Presbyterian Church (The Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church had been invited to become a member of the Conference, but declined). A proposed credal statement drawn up by the Committee of the two Churches reproduced the testimony made by their predecessors, as given in the paragraph above. (AM-1928-154)

(It is interesting and instructive to note the strong influence of political agreement in the bringing together of Presbyterian bodies in the United States. The division into the Old and New Side Churches, effected in 1741, and healed by the Union of 1758, was concerned with matters other than

those of Church and State. The same may be said of the creation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, that passing-strange progeny of Calvinism and Arminianism, which came upon the stage in 1810. It was the Co-operative Plan of Union with the Congregational Churches, combined with different ideas as to doctrinal strictness, that produced the New-school body in 1837.

In 1858 the United Synod of the South withdrew from the New-school organization over the question of slavery, a distinctly political issue. It was quite natural that this group should have been inclined to fraternize with the Southern Presbyterian Church, when the latter came into being in 1861. Organic union followed soon, with political harmony contributing largely to the uniting of the two bodies.

The earlier pages of this chapter tell the same story in regard to such bodies as the Presbytery of Patapsco, the Synod of Kentucky, etc.

When the Presbyterians of the South, Scotch-Irish by descent and conservative by nature, withdrew from the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, a doctrinal barrier between the liberal New-school and their Northern compatriots was (shaken.) After the Old-school body had made its declarations on the subject of slavery, and had kept company with the New-school Church in profession of loyalty to the Federal Government, with expressions of conviction that the Confederacy, like Carthage, "must be destroyed," the two hearts began to beat as one. In 1870 the union was consummated, but they have not lived ~~happily~~ happily to this day,

for different ideas of adherence to Calvinistic principles of the contracting parties have often led to domestic turmoil.

In 1903 the Northern Presbyterian Church revised its Confession of Faith, and interpretation thereof; and, on the basis of this revision, the Cumberland Church was united with that body. It is significant to note that the section of the South where the Cumberland Church was strong, was, to a great extent, sympathetic toward the cause of the North during the Civil War. This fact is not to be overlooked in listing the causes leading to the union of the Cumberland and Northern Presbyterian Churches in 1906.

The general question of the effect of political harmony on ecclesiastical union in the United States is a distinct topic, without the bounds of the subject of this inquiry. The foregoing incidents are inserted, however, to indicate something of the general background against which the several instances of organic union in which the Southern Presbyterian Church has figured are to be construed. The divisions and reunions of other denominations might be thus investigated, but such procedure is unnecessary for our purposes.)

The Federal Council of Churches

The relation of the Southern Presbyterian Church to the Federal Council of Churches has not been a happy one. The chief contributor to this state of unhappiness is to be found in the very subject of this thesis, "The Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church." The Council has almost invariably proved a

transgressor in those things for which the CHURCH has stood in the matter of the abstinence of the Body of Believers from the affairs which are usually (ascribed) to the Body of Citizens. The Council might well be described as a thorn ^{in the side of} the Spirituality of the Church; so consistently have its acts violated the principles held by the Southern Presbyterian Church.

It was in the year 1912 that the CHURCH re-entered into formal relationship with the Federal Council; which is another way of saying that the Assembly of 1913 was sure to be overtured concerning the continuance of the Church in the federation. This came in the negative form of a communication from the Presbytery of Nashville, asking that the Assembly "do not withdraw from the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America." The answer of the Assembly was to reply to the negative overture in the affirmative, and to express its disapproval of the "Social Service program presented" by the Council. (AM-1913-67)

The Assembly of the following year was constrained to mention nothing worthy of disapprobation in its dealing with the Report of the Council which was submitted to the Church Court. (AM-1914-48)

In 1915 Rev. Dr. Charles S. MacFarland, Secretary of the Federal Council, was "heard with pleasure;" the Council's Reports on Family Life, Lax Relations of the Church and Home, and the Report of the Commission on Sunday Observance "were "strongly" commended. Other acts did not arouse the Assembly to any great heights of enthusiasm. In fact the Assembly's Committee's Report as adopted reads:

"There are actions taken which so do violence to the historic and scriptural position of our Church that we can do naught else than decline to accept the responsibility for them and enter our protest. In some cases they are contrary to the doctrine of the separation of the Church and the State and the only proper attitude of approach which the Church has to the affairs of the State; in others they deal with matters that are wholly extraneous to the recognized mission of the Church on earth. (AM-1915-39ff)

"The matters which we would disavow are such as these:

Action concerning the European War:

' (P.36) The Federal Council hereby suggests to President Wilson and Secretary Bryan that they take steps at an early date to urge upon the governments of the world the need of a universal treaty, providing that the signatory powers agree to enforce the observance of the agreement upon the nation that transgresses the treaty by immediate military intervention.'

Again..'We express the hope that the Congress of the United States will give the several States of the Union the opportunity, according to the principles of our government, to vote for or against a constitutional prohibition amendment.'

Again,'The Country Church...There is no solution of

the problem of the country church apart from the reorganization of rural business.'

" Topics of investigation and report: 'Social Effects of Co-operation'; 'Promotion of Material Property'; 'Educational Betterment'; 'Promotion of Independence and Self-respect'; 'Promotion of Democracy'; 'Solution of the Trust Problem'; 'Promotion of Political Efficiency.'

"In view of these facts, your Committee is forced to one of two conclusions: Either that this Assembly should sever its relations with the Federal Council, or that we postpone action with the hope that the said Council may yet regard the principles for which our Church stands; and we recommend that action be deferred for one year." (AM-1915-39ff)

Dr. MacFarland again appeared before the Assembly in the role of pacificator (1916). That body sent an ultimatum to the Council threatening to withdraw unless some sort of a satisfactory reply was forthcoming. (AM-1916-76)

The Council responded in a communication addressed to the Assembly of 1917, couched in the most general of terms, such as:

"(1) That the Council recognizes with cordial appreciation the service rendered by the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. and fully recognizes its high loyalty to principle and the emphasis it has placed on the spiritual function of the Church, and further that it was the effort and desire of the Council to respect the principles of its constituent members."

"44) That the Council again clearly affirms its adherence to the absolute separation of Church and State."
(AM-1917-49)

This answer of the Council was accepted as satisfactory, but the Assembly's representation in the Council was given instructions to keep check on the federation, in the following words:

"5th. That the Assembly's relation to the Council may be cordial, and that the historic position of the Church may be safeguarded, that the delegation of this Assembly to the Council be directed to use their influence to have the Council avoid policies and actions which are in violation of our distinctive principles." (AM-1917-49ff)

A truce, based perhaps on the fact that the Nation was at war, was called between the CHURCH and the Council during the 1918 Assembly.

Matters apparently were growing worse all the while, however; for the meeting of 1919 found the whole affair before the Court in an aggravated form. Meanwhile the protestations of the CHURCH had proved of about the same avail as those of Jeremiah in an age long since gone by. The Council was accused by the Assembly of having violated its own agreement in

"representing and affirming, as the belief of the Churches connected with it, certain views on political relations, international relations, labor and capital problems, wage questions and working days, woman's work, race problems, the making of laws and

the enforcement of the same, treaties with foreign countries, woman's full political and economic equality, and---as though the foregoing list were not sufficiently exhaustive--similar questions." (AM-1919-55)

From the Council the 1920 Assembly received a lengthy communication in reply. Among its illuminating revelations was:

"it is our judgment that with a proper understanding of the situation, there is no real line of cleavage between the principles of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the Constitution of the Federal Council." (AM-1920-66)

--an excellent illustration of the age old practice of appealing to creed when reproached for violation thereof.

The Assembly, thereupon, wasted its breath in another protest; and no great agitation of the matter was revived until 1922. That year found the Assembly unwilling to make any appropriation to the work of the Council? (AM-1922-33) Instead, a rather half-hearted blessing was bestowed upon the Council, but no cash. Remorse must have set in during the next twelve months, however, for in 1923, \$750 was voted for the Council's work; and the regular annual instructions issued to the CHURCH'S delegation to "zealously safeguard the spirituality of the Church and bear witness in all their deliberations to the fundamental and historic positions of" the Church." (AM-1923-29)

The identical procedure was enacted the following year, even to the instructions to "zealously safeguard, etc." (AM-1924-44)

Only two Presbyteries overtured the Assembly of 1925 to withdraw from the Council; so no protest was entered against its actions, and even the customary admonitions to the representatives to "safeguard the historic positions of the Church" were omitted. (AM-1925-50)

Nothing worthy of condemnation was found by the Assembly of 1926 in the year's acts of the Council. (AM-1926-83)

In 1927 a somewhat extended criticism was made concerning the usual exertions of the habitually offending body in the field of politics, and such unchurchly lines of endeavor. (AM-1927-39) Instructions to the Church's representative were varied so as to read "witness against" those things in the Council which transgressed the principles of Southern Presbyterianism.

The following extract from "The Christian Observer" of May 30, 1928, tells the story of that year:

"It has come to be an annual item of business for the Assembly to consider whether or not it will maintain connection with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The Standing Committee on Bills and Overtures brought in a recommendation that overtures asking withdrawal from the Federal Council be answered in the negative, while 'reaffirming our historic position in regard to the spiritual nature and extent of church power.' This was adopted without discussion and by an overwhelming vote."

The Assembly of 1929 has a feast of bad things in store for itself. The Federal Council, in celebrating its twentieth anniversary, at a meeting held in Rochester, N. Y., December 5-11, 1928, took its accustomed plunge into the realm of things with which it should have no concern, or, at least, which should be approached in a far different manner from that in which the body handles them. ("Christian Observer," Dec. 26, 1928, Pages 6 and 7)

As was said at the beginning of this section, the relation of the Southern Presbyterian Church to the Federal Council has not been a happy one. Yet the very state of affairs which has called forth objection from the CHURCH has afforded an opportunity for testimony in behalf of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church--and opportunity which has been so consistently utilized that it has wellnigh degenerated into a farce.

For the sake of completeness it is necessary that two pertinent references to Spirituality be noticed at this point.

Rev. James Chalmers and Rev. James Hood Wilson, of the Free Church of Scotland, were appointed deputies to the General Assembly of 1874. Although it proved impossible for these brethren to actually attend the meeting of the Assembly, that body was led to take notice of their appointment as follows:

"This Assembly sincerely regrets that the other official engagements of these distinguished brethren rendered it impossible for them to be present at our sessions, and that we have been, on that account, denied the privilege of returning to them, and through

them to the Church to which they belong, our fraternal salutations and the sentiments of profound and affectionate regard which we entertain for the Free Church of Scotland. We have not been unobservant, indifferent spectators of the noble stand taken by that Church in behalf of sound doctrine and of the crown-rights of our Divine Lord. With ourselves, they are witness-bearers for Christ's Kingship in Zion, even unto the spoiling of their goods." (AM-1874-515)

Similar testimony was borne to the part played in the struggle for Spirituality by the Reformed Church in America by the Assembly of 1903. Seven overtures were presented to that body, all asking that the Assembly appoint a Committee of Conference to meet with a like committee of the Reformed Church, to consider the matter of closer relations and possible organic union with that Church. The adopted Report of the Committee of Foreign Correspondence, to which the requests were referred, reads:

"We recommend that the Assembly reiterate again, as it has done in the past, its entire confidence in the doctrinal soundness of the Reformed Church in America; its appreciation of the noble testimony which this body of Christians has borne to the spirituality of the church of Christ; its genuine and warm affection for these brethren, and the Assembly's readiness to appoint such a committee of conference whenever the General Synod of the Reformed Church shall

indicate that such a committee would be agreeable to it." (AM-1903-468)

It will be observed from the foregoing incidents that the CHURCH is not only ready to practice the Spirituality of the Church herself, but to commend in others the principles for which she has always stood, regarding the crown rights of the Redeemer.

The accustomed zeal of the Assembly in contending for the proper emphasis upon this doctrine by all those organizations in which the CHURCH participates, was illustrated by the instructions issued to her representation in the rocket-like Inter-Church World Movement. The recommendation of the Committee on Bills and Overtures contained the following recommendation:

"That these representatives be instructed to safeguard the historic position of the Presbyterian Church in the United States concerning the spiritual character of the mission and work of the Church of God." (AM-1920-52)

Chapter ^{Five}~~Six~~ has shown:

- 1 The unusual manner in which the CHURCH has brought to the fore her idea of the nature and mission of the Church in all matters relating to the union of the CHURCH with other branches of the Presbyterian family;
- 22 The consistent, though unavailing, protest of the ASSEMBLY against those numerous acts of the Federal Council of Churches which have violated the Doctrine of the Spirituality ~~of the~~ Spirituality of the Church, together with several incidental references to that principle.

Futher evidence of how the Presbyterian Church in the United States has regulated her conduct in accord with her doctrine will be presented in the following pages, under the title, "A Living Creed."

CHAPTER SIX

A LIVING CREED

It is not an easy thing to put the principles of Spirituality into practice in the every-day life and work of the Church. But, as in the case of Christian profession and the Christian walk, so must the doctrine of Spirituality be followed by ecclesiastical actions which ring true to those points which have been stressed in the official teachings of the Body of God's People. A Church, like an individual, can easily say its say; in is in the doing of the deed that we are to look for the confirmation of pure doctrine.

The rural congregations of Sugaw Creek and Hopewell, of North Carolina, voiced the difficulty of determining how conduct in the realm of Spirituality should follow creed, in the early days of Southern Presbyterianism. The fact that the two Churches were served by the same minister led their Sessions to meet together, for the purpose of drawing up a set of laws for the government of the two organizations. The paper in which these were set forth, dated May 5th, 1793, touches upon the matter as follows:

"2rd. As a church judicature we will not intermeddle with that which belongs to the civil magistrate, either as an officer of the State, or as a minister of justice among the citizens. The line between the church and state being so fine, we know not how to draw it, therefore we leave it to Christian prudence and longer experience to determine." (Foote: "Sketches of North Carolina"-211).

Such were the words written more than seventy years before the organization of the CHURCH; in them is a revelation of the humility in the hearts of the precursors of Southern Presbyterianism, which is eminently worthy of emulation on the part of their spiritual descendants.

For the sake of convenience, the acts of the CHURCH in which adherence to the expressed principle of Spirituality is evidenced will be considered under the following heads: (1), War and Peace; (2), The Sabbath; (3), Temperance and Prohibition; (4), Miscellaneous Civil Laws and Issues; (5), Secular Affairs; (6), Governmental Establishment of Religion. The order of arrangement under these titles is chronological. Let us see if the CHURCH, through the heat of conflict, has kept the law.

(1) War and Peace

At the end of the first year of the War, the Assembly of 1862 made expression of its interest in the men who composed the Armies of the Confederacy, in a resolution that is worthy of mention for the manner in which the religious element is exalted and the secular excluded:

"Resolved, 2. That it be recommended to the churches under the care of this Assembly to offer special prayer on the last Sabbath of every month for all our baptized young men now in the army--that God may preserve them from all evil and make them faithful to the captain of their salvation." (AM-1862-15)

The great conflict had terminated and the din of battle had been silenced for years, when, in 1898, war broke out with Spain. As so frequently occurs in such times of stress, there was a great temptation to the ministers of the CHURCH to introduce topics into their pulpits which were better fitted for the forum. This same war was likewise the occasion of a forgetfulness of the sanctity of the Sabbath; and many newspapers began to depart from their customs, to issue Sunday editions of their publications. Under such circumstances the Assembly of that year unanimously adopted a paper, a section of which has already been noted, which in part reads:

"In view of the fact that the government of the United States is now engaged in a war, which naturally creates excitement, and more or less tension of anxiety from time to time, with reference to the results of battles on land and sea, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States would call attention of all our ministers to the historic position of the Church on all such matters; that while ministers and people, in public and private, should pray for our rulers, and for the officers and men of the army and navy, and that peace with honor may soon be established, yet it is the duty of ministers to proclaim from their pulpits at all times nothing but "the glorious gospel of the blessed God," according to the Church's commission from her sovereign Head, Jesus Christ the Lord." (AM-1898-222)

The CHURCH has ever taken a sane view on the much-discussed question of International Peace; and has proved ready to make such deliverances upon this important subject as she believes to be in accord with her mission in the world and the teachings of the Word of God (See Chapter VII).

In the early days of an organized effort of this sort, the Assembly of 1899 was led in prayer by the Moderator for the blessings of God upon the forth-coming Conference to be held at The Hague, Holland. When the proposition was made looking toward the securing of the Assembly's endorsement of that Conference, however, the overture was answered in the negative. (AM-1899-423)

The record of the General Assembly of 1901, meeting in Little Rock, Arkansas, presents a problem for wise discernment. An invitation was issued to the Assembly to attend the "decoration of ex-Confederate graves," by the local camp of Confederate Veterans. "The Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly" (1910, 1922) has cataloged the reply of the Assembly under the head, "Non-secular Character of the Church." The words of response follow:

"The invitation is received with thanks, and we express our profound sympathy with our friends on the occasion, and our regret that we are unable, on account of the pressure of business, to take a recess in order ~~that permit the members of the Assembly~~ to attend" (AM-1901-29)

The question which naturally arises is, "What would have been

the reply of the Assembly had the 'pressure of business' not prevented the attendance of the Court upon the services?"

The stress of the Great War which began in 1914, and into which the United States was drawn three years later, proved another occasion of the trying of the souls of men. The temptation to substitute sacrifice of self as a gospel for that of Jesus Christ induced the Assembly of 1918 to send a letter to its churches, in which the error so prevalent was deprecated. In part the Letter reads:

"....and this challenge is more urgent for the reason that much precious time is being wasted by Christian leaders in presenting ethics, patriotism and other non-essentials, and for the reason that it is sometimes stated to the men that the supreme sacrifice of patriotism will take the place of repentance and acceptance of a personal Saviour." (AM-1918-53ff)

The timely question of reduction of Armaments was presented to the Assembly of 1921, in the form of a communication from the Federal Council and from the World Alliance of Churches. That Court gave expression of its interest in such steps; and, at the same time, saved itself from the complications foreseen in entering as a body into the movement as then formulated, in the response:

"While we hail with joy any world movement looking toward the reduction of armaments, we feel that this is a matter that should be handled by the Council itself rather than by its Constituent bodies acting

ing in their separate capacity as Churches. We gladly call attention to the letter addressed by the Council to our pastors on this subject." (AM-1921-34)

A resolution on world peace, offered to the Assembly of 1925 by Dr. D. P. McGeachy, & containing a strong statement in opposition to war, was replaced by the following resolve, couched in very general terms:

"Resolved, That the Assembly put itself on record as favoring every worthy effort to secure the peace of the world." (AM-1925-95)

Writing of the work of this Assembly, in the "Union Seminary Review" of July, 1925, Dr. W. L. Lingle records the incident:

"A strong anti-war resolution was adopted and then reconsidered and replaced by one that was a bit milder. The leading advocates of the peace resolution were a group of the younger men who were in the great war." (379)

An opportunity for testimony on the part of the CHURCH as regards its witness for Spirituality was offered, the same year, in a proposal from the American Peace Award Committee. The Assembly's answer is self-explanatory; and is found in the adopted Report of the Standing Committee on Foreign Correspondence:

"II. We recommend that in view of the fact that the American Peace Award Committee is dealing with matters not in accord with the historic position of

our church in the matter of the separation of church and state, that this request be answered in the negative." (AM-1925-50)

It is not to be inferred from the foregoing that the Southern Presbyterian Church is unfavorable toward efforts made in behalf of the peace of the world. On the contrary, as we shall see in the next chapter, it was from the CHURCH that the earlier ecclesiastical movements came which looked toward the securing of world amity. Furthermore, the result of the training given by the CHURCH to those who grow up under her nurture and admonition, is to be seen in the valiant work of that Son of her Manse, who strove so earnestly for the cause of the League of Nations, in the days following the close of the Great War. As we have already noticed, it was into the home of Joseph R. Wilson, Permanent Clerk of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY from its founding in 1861 to 1865, and, for the next thirty-three years, the States Clerk of that body, that Thomas Woodrow Wilson was born, on December 28th, 1856. The Church which has produced such a man as was that great President of the United States and leader of the forces of righteousness in the world, can hold high her head in the council chambers of the communions which make up the Body of Christ.

(2) The Sabbath

Throughout the years of her history the Presbyterian Church has proved a strong champion of the Sabbath day. This very fact has often been a source of temptation to that Church to

cross over into the field of politics, in an effort to secure the right sort of laws for the promotion of Sabbath-keeping. No less is this true in the case of that branch of the Presbyterian family which forms the subject of our present study. Moreover, in regard to this aspect of the question of the relation of Church and State there has at times been a tendency on the part of the CHURCH to diverge from her usual positions on such matters.

The first occasion upon which we meet this issue in a perusal of the Minutes of the Assembly is in the year 1883. The resulting answer to an overture on this subject not only contains a clear statement of the CHURCH'S attitude toward the matter in hand, but also proclaims the doctrine of the Southern Presbyterian Church concerning all proposals in which the Church may seek to secure the advancement of its causes by means of civil legislation. The deliverance of the Assembly (a section of which has already been quoted) reads:

"While recognizing the right of the Church, as citizens, to bring the matter of the observance of the Sabbath to the notice of the civil government, by petition or otherwise, yet it is the judgment of the Assembly, that it is not competent for the Church, in its organic capacity, to seek the intervention of the civil powers for the accomplishment of any of the ends before it, as a witness for the truth of God. The Assembly would, furthermore deprecate all action which might be construed as committing the Church to any alliance with associa-

tions or societies outside its pale for the accomplishment of this, or any other object, however worthy in itself." (AM-1883-24,25)

The following year, furnished yet another opportunity for witness-bearing. The Presbytery of St. John's, of the Synod of South Georgia and Florida, had taken action as expressed in the following resolutions:

"Resolved, That all our Sessions be requested to call attention of the executors of the law and the grand juries of the courts to the statutes enacted by the Legislature touching the Sabbath; that they take such measures as wisdom and prudence suggest to have the offenders brought to justice, and the laws of God and the State vindicated."

The Synod had, quite rightly, taken exception to this act of the Presbytery; and the latter court overtured the Assembly to reverse the decision of the Synod. The General Assembly sustained the Synod, and pointed to the deliverance of the former Assembly (See above) for its position in regard to the matter in question. (AM-1884-209)

The Assembly of 1898 declined to petition the Postmaster-General on the Sabbath mail question; thus continuing to follow the precedent established by earlier Assemblies. (AM-1898-240)

An overture from the Presbytery of Arkansas caused the Assembly of 1903 to formally refer to the Confession of Faith as prohibiting the action ^{sought} ~~requested~~ in the request. The proposal asked:

"that a representative committee be appointed by the Assembly, the duty of which committee shall be, in the most effective way, to take up the question of Sabbath observance with the executive departments of our government, with the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the leading railway corporations, to the end that influences emanating from these centers of power may as far as possible secure a cessation from all executive, governmental and railroad work on the Sabbath day."

The answer of the Assembly:

"Fully realizing the vital importance of the Sabbath as a divine institution, given to man in his estate of innocence and for his highest good to conserve what is best in Church and State, yet we cannot grant the request, inasmuch as it would be in violation of our fundamental law as shown in Confession of Faith, Chapter XXXI, Section 4." (AM-1903-500)

A similar reply was given to the Secretary of the American Sabbath Union, in answer to the request that the Assembly recognize that body in an official manner, and send authorized representatives to the Sunday Rest Congress, to be held in St. Louis, Missouri., October 6, 7, and 8, 1904. The words of the Assembly were:

"Wishing you abundant success in your very laudable work, and realizing the deadly nature of the tremendous forces at work for the destruction of the Sabbath as a day of sacred rest, still, as a court of

the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, who in the presence of Pilate declared, 'My kingdom is not of this world,' we cannot grant the request for the reason that it would be a departure from the teachings of the Great Head of the Church, as also from our Standards, as seen in Confession of Faith, Chapter XXXI, Section 4." (AM-1903-500)

In this instance, we see that the appeal is taken, not only to the Confession, as the Constitution of the CHURCH, but also to the teachings of That One to Whom the Church belongs.

The Presbytery of Arkansas, however, was not to yield its point without protest. So another overture was brought before the Assembly of the next year (1904), designed to induce the railroads to abandon the operation of freight and passenger trains on Sunday, and likewise the ending of Sunday mail service by the Government. The Assembly applied that part of the overture which concerned its own constituents, and discarded the remainder, in the following terms:

~~The Assembly has not~~ ^{the Assembly has not} ~~the request of this overture.~~ ^{the request of this overture.} But the Assembly would insist upon the members of our Church abstaining from the use of Sunday mails and railway trains." (AM-1904-52)

Substantially the same answer was given to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1922, on the occasion of a proposal from that body asking the Assembly's endorsement of a national Sunday law, designed to stop all Interstate Sunday

trains, newspapers, and mails. The Assembly's communication, declining to enter into such plans, concluded:

"But it is not the practice of our Church to participate officially in matters of civil legislation; the function of the Church, as the Body of Christ, being, in our belief, spiritual and not civil." (AM-1921-61)

Careful as the CHURCH has been to avoid the mixing ^{of} things civil and ecclesiastical in regard to the Sabbath, the voice of her Highest Court has consistently rung with demands that Southern Presbyterians obey the laws of God as represented by the Fourth Commandment. Among her declarations we find:

"That sessions take notice of the violation of the Sabbath by members of the Church....it be regarded as an offence demanding and justifying suspensions." (AM-1885-413)

"That the General Assembly.....condemns in most emphatic terms the publication and reading of Sunday editions of newspapers." (AM-1886-52)

"We protest against our ministers of the gospel, ruling elders and deacons, officers-bearers in our own churches, making use of such conveyances as will mar their usefulness as examples to the flocks in which God has set them to govern and serve." (The foregoing refers to Sunday travel) (AM-1890-49)

Further notice of the acts of the Church concerning the Sabbath will be found in the Chapter following, when we shall study the "Discord of Creed and Conduct."

(3) Temperance and Prohibition

The labor of many years, on the part of right-minded citizens, came to a climax in the enactment of a prohibition law by the Federal Government in 1920. The fight during that period presented many temptations to the Churches of America to step into the field of active politics, in their efforts to promote the cause of temperance by the outlawing of the liquor traffic. More than one denomination succumbed to the moral appeal presented by the matter; and fought for the cause which they believed to be right with the weapons of the world. We turn to the part played by the Southern Presbyterian Church in this struggle between the Knights of the Bar and the disciples of Guyon.

It is necessary to go back to 1878, only seventeen years after the organization of the CHURCH, for the beginning of this investigation. The Presbytery of Lexington had overtured the Assembly to "make deliverance with reference to the duties of Sessions in regard to members of the Church under their care engaged in the retail of ardent spirits." The answer of the Assembly was made by referring to the action of the Assembly of 1842 (Old-school), in regard to the minutes of the Synod of Pittsburg:

Resolved, That the records be approved, except so far as they seem to establish a general rule in regard to the use and sale of ardent spirits as a beverage, which use and sale are generally to be decidedly disapproved, but each case must be decided in view

of all the attendant circumstances that go to modify and give character to the same." (AM-1878-635)

In this case the thing disapproved is not the intrusion of the Church into the sphere of the State, but the attempt to lay down hard and fast rules for guidance under any and all circumstances.

The question of politics did, however, come up before the Assembly of 1888, when a committee was appointed to "prepare and report to the next General Assembly a paper, touching the intemperate use of intoxicating drinks; to the intent that the churches under our care may be exhorted to the performance of their whole duty in suppressing this great evil, and may be also instructed and guarded concerning erroneous opinions connected therewith." (AM-1888-387) Apparently a fear arose in the minds of the members of the Assembly that the foregoing might result in a deliverance of a political nature. We find, therefore, that this same Assembly dispelled all such apprehensions by the following declaration:

"Resolved, That the action taken by this General Assembly on the third day of its sessions in appointing a committee on Temperance was not intended to commit this Assembly to or against any political questions of prohibition or so-called moral reform now agitating the mind of the public; but the purpose ~~was to have~~ the committee formulate the views of the church upon the question of temperance."
(AM-1888-391)

The Assembly of 1891 urged "our people to use all means, which may be approved by their Christian conscience and judgment, to remedy this evil throughout the land." (AM-1891-244) Today the use of "all means" would surely suggest civil legislation; but it is to be noted that the act of the individual is to be regulated by the individual conscience--a method by which the Church may justly and rightly influence the making of the laws and the execution of the same.

The same Assembly found time to politely decline to appoint delegates to the Tenth National Temperance Convention, which was to be held at Saratoga Springs, during that year. (AM-1891-228) Like action was taken in 1893, in connection with an invitation to send delegates to a World's Temperance Congress, in Chicago. (AM-1893-52)

A question of what might be styled International Prohibition was before the Assembly of 1892. A request was presented to the Assembly from the New Hebrides Mission Synod, desiring that that Court "appeal to the government of the United States, through the President, to concur with other powers in prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors, firearms and ammunition in the South Sea Islands." The reply is characterized by sound common sense plus a classic statement of the province of the Church (It has been partially given in a previous chapter):

"Resolved, That while we heartily sympathize with the Mission in their opposition to the sale of intoxicating liquors in those islands, and heartily

desire that goodwill and peace may everywhere prevail among our fellow men, yet we do not think it would be wise, that, as a church, we should advise the United States government as to what action it should take in the premises, for the reason that the church has no right to interfere with, or attempt to control, the civil policy of the State."
(AM-1892-457)

The separation of the moral and political aspects of temperance was made in a deliverance on that subject, by the Assembly of 1895:

"Resolved, That the General Assembly reiterates the deliverances of previous Assemblies on the subject of temperance, and, without any reference to the political aspect of the temperance reform, urges upon all Christians the duty of using all legitimate means to promote the cause of good citizenship, especially by refusing to be identified in any way with the liquor traffic, the greatest and boldest modern enemy of the church and home, and deprecates the inconsistency of professing Christians who rent their property for immoral purposes." (AM-1895-408)

Two years later (1897) the Assembly was asked by the secretary of the North Carolina Prohibition Party "to make some deliverance and declaration of principles on the all-important subject of temperance." The occasion was utilized to strike a note of ~~non~~-political activity on the part of the Church, and to reply that the position of the Church on such matters

was abundantly attested by past deliverances:

"That alike by uniform practice and Constitution we are forbidden to intermeddle with political parties or questions, and that the constant and scriptural attitude of our beloved church on temperance and intemperance, as shown in past deliverances on record, is too well known to require restatement."

(AM-1897-17)

The extreme care of the Assembly in this regard is to be evidenced by action taken soon after the issuance of the foregoing response. In order to make the position of the Assembly clear beyond all controversy, the following expression of the attitude of that body toward prohibition as a political issue was adopted:

"Resolved, That in the action by the Assembly in adopting the report of the Committee on Bills and Overtures in reply to a communication from the Executive Committee of the Prohibition Party of North Carolina, this Assembly is not to be construed as intending to commit the church to the political theory of prohibition, either pro or con." (AM-1897-19)

That organization which later was to grow so powerful in advancement of the cause of legislated prohibition in the United States, the American Anti-Saloon League, invited the Assembly of 1903 to send delegates to their National Convention of that year. Once more an opportunity was afforded for an expression of the feeling of the CHURCH in regard to such alliances:

"This General Assembly is in full sympathy with the object which the league proposes to accomplish; yet as we represent an organization that is purely spiritual, and whose uniform practice has been to decline affiliations with all secular organizations, however worthy in themselves, it would be a departure from our established practice to comply with the request of the league, and for such departure in this instance we see no sufficient reason." (AM-1903-470)

Overtures from ten Presbyteries and the Synod of Alabama were presented to the Assembly of 1907, asking the appointment of a Permanent Committee on Temperance. This the Assembly declined to do, for the following reasons:

"(1) that the position of our Church is sufficiently well known on this question, and (2) such a measure would add indefinitely to the machinery of our Church, and would involve the possibility of political entanglement." (AM-1907-57)

It must be admitted that it is difficult to see just how the appointment of such a committee would lead to "political entanglement;" but the expression of such fear by the Assembly indicates the fidelity with which that body strove to remain true to the position of the CHURCH in the matter.

It is to be regretted that the acts of the CHURCH in regard to prohibition must be treated again in the following chapter; and, in the second instance, we shall find that on several occasions the Fathers failed to practice the doctrine so aptly expressed and illustrated in the pages of this volume.

(4) Miscellaneous Civil Laws and Issues

It is only natural that a church, in the course of its relations with the government of that land in which it exists, should, from time to time, be tempted to enter into political alliances, and attempt to influence the workings of the State powers by various means. In such instances as those sporadic questions which arise from matters in which the Church naturally has an interest, it is far easier for the ecclesiastical body to err, than in dealing with the more chronic propositions which have been treated in the foregoing pages.

When the Church has established a general policy in regard to its attitude toward the Sabbath question and Sabbath laws, or has fixed a precedent in dealing with the issues of Temperance, there is, even then, some likelihood of a court of that Church being caught off its guard and led into making utterance not in keeping with the general doctrine of the Church. On the other hand, however, when various and sundry matters are continually presented to the court for consideration, it is very easy for that power to fail to take note of all the ways in which the principle of Spirituality may be violated, without even a realization of the fact that such a thing is being done. It now falls to our lot to examine a number of instances in which these diverse questions have been treated by the Assembly.

The early years of the life of the CHURCH were remarkably free from such incidents; but in 1890 an opportunity was offered for discernment on the part of the Fathers in Israel. The actual question was that of appointing a committee to work in connection with the taking of the Federal Census. This the

Assembly declined to do; but showed its willingness to assist in the expedition of the work by earnestly urging the Stated Clerks of the different Presbyteries to "co-operate promptly with the proper census officers, and to render them all the assistance possible in securing" the information desired by the Government." (AM-1890-34)

Two years later, in 1892, the ASSEMBLY found it necessary to refuse to participate in a movement sponsored by the National League for the Protection of American Institutions for securing the enactment of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (AM-1892-439)

The question of the CHURCH'S Foreign Mission work was involved in a petition presented to the Assembly of the following year (1893), by the Chinese Mission, of New Orleans, Louisiana. An immigration act, known as the Geary Law, had been passed by Congress, which was designed to check the coming of the Chinese into this country. As is so frequently the case under such circumstances, there was violent protest against it by that race against which it was directed. The end sought in the petition was an overture by the Assembly to Congress, asking that the Geary Law be suspended. One member of the Assembly moved that the Court petition Congress to repeal or modify the measure; but the motion was lost. An answer to the request from the Chinese Mission was incorporated in the Report of the Standing Committee of Foreign Missions, to which body the petition had been referred by the Assembly. In part it reads:

"....And we recommend that unceasing prayer be made in our churches that all their interests may be protected, and that the legislation touching these delicate matters may be so guided and overruled that no wrong may be inflicted upon the Chinese in our land, and that our mission work in China may not be interrupted nor endangered." (AM-1893-16,39,42,54)

Another angle of the general problem was presented to the Assembly of 1901; and the question of state aid for religious schools was disposed of by the statement that the matter was clearly covered by the Constitution of the CHURCH, and had formed the theme of deliverances by past Assemblies. (AM-1901-22)

The nefarious White Slave Traffic was the subject of a communication to the Assembly of 1913, in which it was asked that the Court pass resolutions condemning this horrible business. The Committee to which the letter was referred simply recommended that it be answered in the negative, the Assembly subsequently adopting the Committee's report. (AM-1913-~~29~~28am)

The minutes of the Synod of Mississippi, of the year 1921, furnished the Assembly of the following year with an opportunity to renew its testimony to the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church. The Synod had expressed itself in regard to a certain proposed change in the civil law as follows:

"We appeal to the fair-minded citizenship of our State to go to the polls when this question shall be submitted to a vote, and ratify this proposed change."

This led the Assembly to comment, through the adopted report

"Your Committee is of the opinion that the above appeal to the citizenship of the State to influence them in a civil matter, is contrary to the letter and spirit of our constitution."

The Assembly, therefore, did not approve that portion of the Minutes of the Synod relating to the above matter. (AM-1922-77)

The Political Campaign of 1928

The recent past furnishes an excellent illustration of the manner in which the CHURCH deals, or rather does not deal, with political issues which are filling the minds of the citizens of the State. The Presidential campaign of 1928 was an unusual event in the history of American politics.

The nominee of the Republican Party, Herbert Hoover, was a cosmopolite in the fullest sense of the term. A member of the Quaker Church, he planted himself upon the platform of his party in regard to the matter of the Eighteenth Amendment to the Constitution, and proclaimed his advocacy of national prohibition.

The Democrats, on the other hand, after including a prohibition plank in their party platform, proceeded to nominate Governor Alfred E. Smith, of New York, for the Executive Office. Mr. Smith promptly repudiated the platform of his party so far as the issue of Prohibition was concerned; and forthwith initiated his campaign with the avowed intention and purpose of securing the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and turning over the control of the Liquor Question to the in-

dividual States of the Union.

But the end was not yet. The Democratic Nominee was a member of the Roman Catholic Church; and, as such, his fitness for the office of President was questioned by a great many of the thinking people of the nation, from the Editor of a Unitarian journal in Boston, to the President of the ASSEMBLY'S TRAINING SCHOOL FOR LAY WORKERS, in Richmond, Virginia. The opposition of these two gentlemen, representing the poles of religious thought, was not based on religious grounds as such, but rather on the fact that the Catholic Church is doctrinally opposed to the principles of American Government. With the example of Mexico to the south, and the memory of the Roman Catholic Church of the past, many members of the CHURCH simply did not care to have a member of that faith inaugurated as President of the country.

And, even yet, there is more. Mr. Smith was the leader and foremost exponent of one of the rottenest political organizations which has ever graced, or disgraced, the annals of American political institutions--Tammany Hall. This fact was not designed to make the members of the Southern Presbyterian Church, the overwhelming majority of whom were Democrats both by birth and persuasion, feel the more kindly toward him. An avowed wet, a Roman Catholic, the Chief trainer of the Tammany Tiger--with such connections was he presented to the voters of the CHURCH as their duly nominated candidate for the highest office in the land. (In fairness to Mr. Smith, let it be said that he had proved an able executive of the great

State of New York, and had demonstrated a fearlessness and ability that were praiseworthy.)

Many of the representative ecclesiastical organizations of the Southland entered into the political fight with all the fervor of the Crusaders of old. Resolutions were passed; sermons were preached; ministerial influences were devoted to keeping Smith out of the White House, and saving the nation from a return to the days when whiskey could be bought in a legal manner.

The attitude of many religious leaders cannot be better depicted than by a quotation from a recent issue of "The Christian Century," entitled, "Should the Churches keep Silent?" The subject matter deals with the very question so much to the fore in the campaign; and the article ends:

"Slavery was not abolished in this country until it became a moral issue. Perhaps we should repeal the fourteenth amendment as well as the eighteenth, and rely wholly upon moral suasion addressed to individuals to restrain them from holding their fellow-men in involuntary servitude ! The truth is that neither emancipation nor prohibition is a matter of private morals, or of forcing conformity to a moral code. But they are matters of public morals, involving the welfare of society as a whole. In such issues, the church has a direct concern, and in such conflicts it will utilize the full force of its influence, so far as its conscience has been enlightened, to secure and enforce such legislation

as the common welfare may demand." ("Christian Century"-Feb. 7, 1929-191)

The influential Dover Baptist Association, centering around Richmond, Virginia, did not hesitate to give vent to opinion in no uncertain tones:

"We recognize fully that Baptist churches and our other denominational bodies exist for spiritual ends, and that they can properly take no action in purely political affairs or exercise authority over the individual conscience in any matter.

"We recognize also the right and responsibility of this body to state, as it has repeatedly done, its convictions in regard to the policy of prohibition, by which the legalized liquor traffic has been eliminated from our country.....

"We do most earnestly exhort our people to face candidly the actual situation and do their duty as good citizens of the State and country. We urge them to keep clear in their thinking the tremendously important principles involved in this question... If to do this should require the severance of long recognized affiliations or should bring upon them personal censure and possible loss, let them remember the promises to those who suffer for righteousness' sake."

The Association then called upon its constituency to "co-operate fully with" the Anti-Saloon League "in its efforts to

prevent the return of the saloon in any form." ("Richmond Times-Dispatch"-July 16, 1928-1)

On the 27th of July, 1928, four Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, issued a declaration in defense of their activities in the campaign. The paper, signed by Bishops Edwin Mouzon, Hohm M. Moore, Horace H. DuBose, and James Cannon, Jr., ~~declared~~ that their opposition to the election of Smith was "in full accord with the highest authority" of their Church. It was made up, for the most part, of quotations, which were intended to show how the Methodist Episcopal Church, South had taken action in previous years similar to that of the Bishops. ("Richmond Times-Dispatch"-July 27, 1928)

The lurid editorial written by Dr. Walker, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (and promptly repudiated by many of the leading clergymen of his Church, however) has already been discussed in the chapter entitled, "The Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church." (Pages 117-119)

The writer is aware of no single instance in which the political campaign was even touched upon by the courts of the Southern Presbyterian Church, from the Session, that serveth in the quiet of its own community, to the General Assembly, which voices those things pertaining to the whole of the CHURCH. This, however, may simply be an indication of the fact that he is not cognizant of all that is taking place in all of the eighty-eight Presbyteries. The same blessed ignorance was, nevertheless, professed by another minister whose parish

lies in a distant portion of the wide territory in which the work of the CHURCH is done. But what of the High Court ? A secular newspaper, speaking through its editor, will be allowed to tell the story:

"They Stick to their Knitting

"The Southern Presbyterians adjourned their annual General Assembly in Atlanta Tuesday and without going on record in threatening gestures that they would quit the Democratic party if it nominated Al Smith for President or pledging their loyalty to the Kingdom above party demands or any such resolutions as would identify them as churchmen with affairs purely and strictly political.

"You don't catch these Southern Presbyterians straying away from their traditional leanings on matters of this kind. They believe in keeping the business of the Church separate from the business of the State, rendering 'unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's.'

"And there is something admirable about their loyalty in this regard. While many other denomination is finding its Church court unable to keep its hands off the present political situation, the Southern Presbyterians continue to 'seek first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness,' believing that any individual, any Church, any institution, any State that does this will find in the end that all the other proper and essential things shall be added unto it."

("Charlotte News"-May 1928)

(5) Secular Affairs

At this point it is necessary to note several actions of the GENERAL ASSEMBLY, different by nature from the foregoing, which bear upon the question which constitutes the subject of this paper. These matters are exceptions to the general rule that the principle of the Spirituality of the Church involves contrast with the world of politics; for here we encounter three instances in which the rulings of the Assembly were based upon the notion of Spirituality, with no relation to affairs political.

The reader will have observed that the "Southern Presbyterian Review" has been very frequently quoted to show the attitude of the CHURCH and its leaders to various aspects of the problem in which we are interested. The Review was a medium often employed for the exposition of the views peculiar to the CHURCH on the matter of the sphere of Body Ecclesiastical. The Assembly of 1867 was asked to pass a resolution "recommending the "Southern Presbyterian Review" to the confidence and patronage of our Church." Apparently the publication was condemned out of its own mouth, when the following minute was adopted:

"Resolved, That while this Assembly, as ministers and elders might cordially adopt the paper presented, yet, as an Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in its ecclesiastical character, it is not competent for us to enact anything concerning other matters than those which are strictly ecclesiastical." (AM-1867-148)

When we remember that the Review was in reality practically the semi-official mouthpiece of the CHURCH, as represented by its leaders of thought, it may be realized that unusual zeal was demonstrated by the Fathers in contending for the principle which had called their communion into being.

Another novel problem was presented for the consideration of the Supreme Legislative Body in 1913, when two Presbyteries overtured the Assembly upon the use of tobacco--this should prove interesting to Scotch ecclesiastics--"by ministers, professors and students in our Theological Seminary." The overtures were simply answered in the negative. Whether or not this incident has any bearing upon the Spirituality of the Church is not easily discovered. In the latest issue of the "Digests of the Acts of the General Assembly" (1922) the episode is listed under the head, "Topics Moral and Secular." The time has not yett come when the matter of the use of the weed has become any great public moral issue, but the signs of the age are already pointing toward that day when the use of tobacco will be discountenanced. In the course of a recent conversation, two elders of the CHURCH, both of whom indulge in the use of the product of the plant, agreed that public opinion would eventually come to the fore in a crusade against the use of tobacco. Already the minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church who smokes is not looked upon by mothers of the congregation with boys who are growing up, as any more desirable on that account.

A beautiful notation of the sanctity and separateness of the Court of the Lord Jesus Christ was embodied in a request to the commissioners to the ASSEMBLY of 1913, when it

was asked that they refrain from applauding during the sessions of that body. (AM-1913-36)

(6) Governmental Establishment of Religion

The establishment of one certain denomination in a position of favoritism by the Government has never proved the problem in this country that it has worked out to be in Europe. Such a thing has never been seriously considered since the establishment of the Republic. It is interesting to learn, however, that an early General Assembly was called upon to declare the principles of Presbyterianism concerning such matters, in 1830. At that time the Assembly delivered itself in no uncertain terms on the subject. (AMUSA-1830-25)

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America lost no time in going on record along this line. The fate of Dr. Thornwell's proposal has been considered (Page 79). The Assembly of that same year in which the Master Thinker advanced his unusual idea of the right for the recognition of Christ in the Constitution of the Confederacy, contrary to the recommendation of its committee, which suggested that no deliverance be made, adopted the following overture:

"The Assembly approves of that clause in the Constitution of the Confederate States which forbids the Congress to enact any law respecting a religious establishment, and understands that prohibition equally

to restrain the Executive from establishing in the public service, in any manner or on any plea whatsoever, one branch of the Church in preference to another." (AM-1861-18)

Consistent action was taken by the Assembly of 1920, upon the proposal (made by a member of another communion) that a move be made relative to securing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States recognizing the "authority and law of Jesus Christ." The Assembly followed the recommendation of its committee, which suggested that no formal action be taken. (AM-1920-61)

Spirituality Attested by the CHURCH

At several points it is to be noticed that the CHURCH'S general doctrine in regard to the separation of the things of the world from those of the Kingdom Eternal is attested in unique fashion. For instance, the quasi-national anthem of the land, "The Star Spangled Banner," is not to be found in the hymnal of the CHURCH. As one reviewer of the book has aptly said, it ought not to be there for it is not a hymn at all. Nevertheless, it is a fact that the song is frequently included in such collections as published by other denominations; and finds a place in the latest book authorized for use by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Two articles in the post-war issues of the "Southern Presbyterian Review" throw much light upon the manner in which the CHURCH, in the times of stress accompanying the War, was, by the grace of God, enabled to walk in those paths which were marked out for her feet by the doctrine which she professed.

Dr. J. B. Adger, of the faculty of Columbia Seminary, writing in the March, 1866, number of that publication, after noting two instances in which the Assembly had digressed from the right way, continues:

"Besides these two utterances made thus inadvertently in its narratives, there is absolutely nothing in the whole proceedings of the Assembly, during all its five sessions, which at all resembles a 'handling of what is not ecclesiastical' " (SPR-March, 1862)

An article entitled "The Church and Politics," published in the same magazine of September-October, 1867, relates the experiences of the author ("B.T.W."), in the following words:

"We were at the South during the whole contest (Civil War); were in South Carolina until she seceded; and were at various times in various communities; and being subject to no military duty were enabled to attend church every Sunday, and on every fast and Thanksgiving day; and we also attended daily prayer meetings in nearly all parts of the country. We never, in any case, heard any political questions argued on any such occasions, unless one doubtful instance be excepted." (SPR-Sept.-Oct., 1867-384) (The burden of the above references ~~are~~^{is}, of course, to Presbyterian services.)

This testimony is in marked contrast to that of Dr. Inglis, the Tory rector of Trinity Church, New York, who wrote in 1776:

"I do not know one Presbyterian minister, nor have I been able after strict inquiry to hear of any who did not by preaching and every effort in his power promote all the efforts of the Continental Congress, however extravagant." ("Presbyterians"-129)

In these two incidents we note, not only the testimony borne to the abstinence of the CHURCH from political matters in her earliest years, but also the care taken to call attention to the fact that such caution was observed in avoiding the things of Caesar. A more extended record of the zeal of the CHURCH in propagating her doctrine of Spirituality is now to be entered.

Zeal of the Church in propagating the doctrine of Spirituality

Not only has the Southern Church always held a high position in regard to the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church; not only has her life confessed the holy doctrine she professes; but by word of mouth she has expressed a desire to preserve the accounts of her actions in this connection for her communicants, her children, and the world at large.

The Magna Charter of this principle, the "Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth," has been treated with such regard as is due this momentous document. At that meeting of the Assembly by which it was adopted, the order was issued that three thousand copies of the paper be printed for the use of the Assembly. (AM-1861-19) This number is indicative of the fact that the plan for distribution

did not confine the circulation of the copies of the "Address" simply to the representatives in attendance upon the sessions of the Assembly, but rather that the idea was to send them throughout the entire Church. The deliverance in its original form was ordered preserved in the archives of the Assembly, along with that paper which bore the signatures of the signers thereof. (AM-1861-19)

Like interest in a proper appreciation of the Church's position was evidenced by the Assembly of 1866, when Drs. T. E. Peck, A. W. Miller, and George Howe were appointed to draw up a paper for submission to the next Assembly on the subject of Church and State in their reciprocal relations. This was never done, however; since the Committee gave the succeeding court reasons for not complying with the order, which were accepted as satisfactory, and the Committee was thereupon discharged. (AM-1866-37: 1867-139)

1870 was that year in which the Northern Church over-tured the Southern Body in regard to union; or rather it was to the Assembly of that year that an overture passed by the Assembly of the U. S. A. Church in 1869 was presented (See Chapter Five). The Pastoral Letter issued in connection with the ASSEMBLY'S answer to the Northern Assembly's move has been considered in a previous chapter; but is mentioned again at this point as an illustration of the care which the ASSEMBLY took to instruct the Churches under its care in its position on the matter of Spirituality. The Committee of Publication was ordered to prepare 5000 copies of the Letter, together with

with the former public utterances of the CHURCH on "Spirituality and Independence." (AM-1870-542)

A proposal was made by the Assembly of 1906 to publish the papers of the CHURCH which deal with the question of Spirituality. (AM-1906-22,48) A committee was appointed with this in view; but the matter was finally dropped in 1909, as "unnecessary and unwise." (AM-1909-16,125)

A committee of the Assembly, intrusted with a study of the problem of Divorce, was commended by that body in 1908, in the following terms:

"The Assembly noted with approval the care of the Committee with reference to the civil aspects of the matter in hand." (AM-1908-82)

The expression of a former member of another communion, who is now a deacon in the CHURCH, after hearing a sermon on the historic position of the Southern Church upon the subject treated in this thesis, is pertinent at this point: "That sermon was enough to make a man glad he is a Presbyterian."

In short, it is quite in accord with the facts to say that the CHURCH never loses an opportunity to testify to what she believes to be the Scriptural doctrine of the relation of Church and State.

Act of the Assemblies of 1875 and 1876

The outstanding instance of the extreme care of the CHURCH for a right appreciation of her position in this matter has been reserved for the place of honor at the end of this portion of the record.

The General Assembly of 1875, taking cognizance of the existence upon the records of the Court of expressions out of harmony with the great principles of the CHURCH concerning Spirituality,

"Resolved, That this matter be referred to a committee of three whose duty it shall be to make a careful examination and report to the next General Assembly, to the end that no vestige of anything inconsistent with the clearly defined position of our General Assembly may be left to impair the testimony of our Church upon this vital point."

(AM-1875-45)

The Committee evidently took the instructions to make their study a careful one in a very literal sense. Nine and one-half pages of a large book are necessary to present their findings, together with the remarks made thereon. It is not to be inferred that such a lengthy compilation was necessitated by the multitude of the transgressions of the Assemblies prior to 1876. As a matter of fact only five separate instances were cited in which the CHURCH'S doctrine had been violated, save in the case of Slavery; and on this topic the Committee made an extended notation.

Of the five acts of the Assemblies contravening the teachings of the Church, three were extracts from "Narratives"-1862, 1863, 1864. The two remaining were found in the "Report of Theological Seminaries" of 1862, and a "Pastoral Letter" of the same year. (It will be seen that all these references are to

that period covered by the Civil War.) Since these violations have been thoroughly treated in the Committee's Report of 1876, no effort will be made to recover the ground in the course of this paper, either at this point, or in Chapter Seven. (The Report may be found in "Alexander's Digest-1910"-Pages 523-533)

The action of the Assembly in regard to these violations as pointed out by the Committee was, in part:

"2. Inasmuch as some incidental expressions^{one}, uttered in times of great public excitement, are found upon our records, and have been pointed out in the report of the committee aforesaid, which seem to be ambiguous, or inconsistent with the above declarations, and others of like import, this Assembly does hereby disavow them wherever found and does not recognize such as forming any part of the well-considered, authoritative teaching or testimony of our Church." (AM-1876-233)

The study of the question of Slavery is one apart from the scope of this paper; which is only touched, from time to time, as it has important bearing upon the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church.

1. The moulding of conduct in accordance with a righteous creed is a difficult, yet necessary, thing in the life of a church.
2. The Southern Presbyterian Church has succeeded in this accomplishment in numerous instances, such as are treated under the heads: (1), War and Peace; (2), The Sabbath; (3), Temperance and Prohibition; (4), Miscellaneous Civil Laws and Issues; (5), Secular Affairs; (6), Governmental Establishment of Religion.
3. A recent and outstanding example of the conduct of the CHURCH in regard to political affairs was furnished by the Presidential Campaign of 1928, when the courts of the Southern Presbyterian Church demonstrated a marked ability to refrain from any attempt to assist Caesar in the conduct of civil affairs.
4. The CHURCH has taken advantage of many opportunities to testify for the Headship of Christ over the Church and the Spirituality of His Body, at times heeding the admonition of the Great Apostles to "buy up the opportunity."
5. Great zeal has been shown by the Southern Presbyterian Church in the propagation of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church.
6. In 1876 the ASSEMBLY officially disavowed certain expressions of that Court of earlier years, wherein the Doctrine of Spirituality had been neglected, and declared that such deviations from its well-established path were not to be interpreted as forming any part of the teaching or testimony of the CHURCH.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE DISCORD OF CREED AND CONDUCT

To err is human, and the Southern Presbyterian Church must be listed in the ranks of the mortals. The manner in which the acts of that body have proved consonant with her teachings has been considered in the chapter preceeding the section upon which we are entering. Yet, like Homer, her official bodies have sometimes nodded; so that the flag of the Spirituality of the Church has not always flown at full mast over the council halls of the CHURCH. In this chapter it is proposed to take up at length each instance in the records of the Assembly in which there is a real or apparent violation of that principle which has so consistently characterized the life and dealings of the Southern Presbyterian Church. (No mention will be made of the report of the special Committee to the Assembly of 1876, and the Assembly's action thereon. See Page 219)

This consideration will embrace: (1), Instances in which there is evident and definite violation of the principle of Spirituality; (2), those wherein transgression has likely taken place; (3), actions, apparently out of harmony with the doctrine of the Church, which are really explicable as being in keeping with her creed. It is needless to say that individual opinions will vary greatly in regard to the nature and import of the incidents which form the basis of investigation at this point. The writer will simply endeavor to present a fair statement of what actually took place, together with his reasons for classifying the examples as he has done.

(1) Definite Violations of the Principle of Spirituality

It is with a clear-cut case that we begin. Before the General Assembly of 1914, meeting in Kansas City, Missouri, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union enacted the part of Eve, in soliciting the Assembly to take action in regard to the matter of Prohibition. The position of the CHURCH has been clearly indicated in an earlier chapter, insofar as this matter is concerned. Officially, it was, and had been, on record in favor of Temperance. The resolution passed in Kansas City reads:

"Resolved, That we are in hearty favor of National Constitutional Prohibition, and will do all properly within our power to secure the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution forever prohibiting the sale, manufacture for sale, transportation for sale, importation for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the United States." (AM-1914-71)

The political nature of the foregoing is self-evident. "National Constitutional Prohibition" was a political method of securing an end. By lending its endorsement thereto, the Assembly had simply gone on record as favoring a certain scheme in the world of politics, in order to secure a moral end.

A number of members of the Court realized this fact when they presented a protest against the action of the Assembly, in which the Resolution was characterized as:

"a deliverance upon a political question and hence a violation of the scriptural function of the Church."

of God and contrary to the historic position of our Church on the right of the Church to make political deliverances." (AM-1914-80b)

In the fall of that same year the Synod of Virginia expressed "strong disapproval" of the Assembly's action on the matter; and overtured the Assembly of 1915 to "reford this action of Synod upon its minutes as our protest against the action of the Kansas City Assembly touching the amending of the Federal Constitution."

The Assembly of 1915, in a weak sort of fashion, declared its "unfaltering allegiance to the principle contended for in the protest," and "earnestly" deprecated any violation of the principle on the part of any of the courts of the CHURCH. No appropriate action was taken in regard to the matter; so today the record stands as a blot upon the Minutes of the Assembly, as an instance of disregard of the high creed of the CHURCH.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America takes a very different position in regard to such matters. While professing to abstain from political deliverances, the Assembly of that Church frequently brings forth strange expressions. In 1926 the Assembly of the USA Church declared:

"We are opposed to any modification of the Volstead ~~would have the same permit the sale of wine or beer for~~ beverage purposes under any guise or method."

(AMUSA-1926-57)

Or even more incisive, and far less ecclesiastical:

"While honoring the place of the will of the people in our democratic form of government and seeking in every way to safeguard its expression and exercise, we deprecate the use of the referendum in matters involving Federal Statutes or Constitution, when the usual and historic procedure of registering the popular will is open to all." (AMUSA-1926-57)

Another instance, in many respects ^{similar} to that cited in connection with the act of the Kansas City Assembly, is the so-called "Sinnot Case," which originated in the ~~Presbytery of Alabama~~ North Alabama, in 1909. The Rev. W. I. Sinnot, of that Presbytery, during the course of a heated political campaign regarding the amending of the State Constitution so as to forbid the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors in Alabama, printed, or allowed to be printed in the daily press, communications "opposing the principle of prohibition in general and the provisions of the Constitutional Amendment in particular."

The Presbytery fought fire with fire, and, evidently not comprehending the sense in which the term "political" is used in connection with the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church, characterized the amendment as "non-political" and "moral" and declared:

"1. That we heartily endorse this amendment to the ~~constitution of the State~~ of the State and urge our people to give it their support so that in the event of its adoption prohibition of the liquor traffic will

be the permanent policy of the State." (AM-1910-43ff)

Very naturally, Mr. Sinnot entered a complaint against the Presbytery of North Alabama with the Synod of Alabama. On account of the tense feeling in the Synod in regard to the Amendment, the matter was referred to the General Assembly.

The Assembly of 1910 appointed a commission to try the case. The vote of the Commission was as follows: to sustain the complaint, 7; not to sustain, 14; not voting, 5; the Chairman not voting. The judgment of the Commission explained that it

"did not mean to recede from or compromise the principle of non-intrusion into civil affairs or affairs which concern the Commonwealth, but to leave our courts free as to the mode of dealing with a gigantic moral evil" (AM-1910-43ff)

The Presbytery of ^{North} Alabama had plunged into a political fight in advocacy of a political measure. The Commission of the General Assembly, acting for, and in the name of that Court, attempted to justify, or at least mitigate, a clear-cut violation of the Constitution of the CHURCH. This cannot be entered upon our record otherwise than as an instance of failure of the ASSEMBLY to vindicate the Constitution of the CHURCH, and to uphold what is according to the oft-repeated declaration of that Assembly, the Scriptural doctrine of non-interference in matters of State.

The stress of war doth try the souls of men--and the vil-
 igance of the Church. The General Assembly of 1918 took occa-
 sion to illustrate this truth in unconscious fashion:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in
 the United States respectfully and earnestly re-
 quests President Woodrow Wilson to use his author-
 ity and influence to prohibit the waste of food and
 fuel, now so much needed, in the manufacture of
 malt and alcoholic liquors by distilleries and brew-
 eries." (AM-1918-33)

It is interesting to note the reason advanced for the plan
 advocated--food and fuel were much needed at that time. The
 usual moral plea, based on the evils of drink, is even lacking.
 A Church court advises the President as to a desirable step to
 be taken in the conduct of the government.

It is difficult to see how this petition might be classed
 under the head of "extraordinary," as sanctioned by the Confes-
 sion, though it must be admitted that it satisfies the usual
 definition of that term in a very literal sense, when coming
 from the General Assembly of the Southern Church. It certain-
 ly violates the spirit of the Constitution of the CHURCH, and
 most probably the letter.

During the first decade of the present century, two mission-
 aries of the CHURCH were engaged in drawing the attention of the
 civilized world to the conduct of the Belgian Government in deal-
 ing with the natives of the Congo. In 1904 these acts were char-

acterized by the Assembly as "the atrocities of the Belgian Government." (AM-1904-43)

In 1906, the Assembly resolved:

"Whereas, repeated atrocities have been committed upon the natives in the Congo Independent State, for which the government is directly responsible, either by permission or connivance; therefore

Be it resolved, First, That the cruelty and atrocities which have been committed by the military authorities of the government of the Congo Independent State, and by the officers and agents of the trading companies, under government protection, upon the people of the Congo Independent State, in Africa, are an outrage on humanity, to which the civilized nations of the world cannot submit.

Second, That we respectfully petition the government of the United States of America, through its Executive Department, to take such action, and bring to bear on the government of the Congo Independent State such pressure as will compel the abatement of this outrage against our common humanity, etc."

(AM-1906-50)

The questions which come into the mind of the reviewer:

Is it fitting for the CHURCH to have thus expressed itself in regard to the acts of the government of a friendly nation?

Is not the call to the United States to bring pressure to bear upon the government of the Congo Free State inconsistent with the nature of that Kingdom, described by its Founder, as "not

of this world?" Has the Church a spiritual right to call upon the Civil Government to right the wrongs which she finds in the world? These queries are called forth, not by a desire to condone the conduct of any government, but in defense of the principle of the Spirituality of Church.

The Assembly of 1919, through its Committee, noted with "patriotic pride and gratitude to God that in the supreme crisis, when all things worth having were at stake, Presbyterians of the South bore their part." (AM-1919-38) Such an expression ill-becomes a Spiritual Court.

The Lord's Day Alliance

With a consideration of the relation of the CHURCH to the Lord's Day Alliance, we shall close our notice of those instances in which there has appeared to be a tendency on the part of the CHURCH to stray away from the principles of Spirituality. In regard to the Federal Council, we have seen that difficulty which the Church has experienced has been in connection with the working out of the various problems which are presented to the Council for its action. With the Lord's Day Alliance, however, the trouble lies at the root of the tree, in that the principle of the very life activity of the Alliance contravenes those things for which the CHURCH has always stood in her formal deliverances.

As far back as 1883, the Southern Presbyterian Church was groping for some sort of cooperative movement among the different denominations, which would enable them to give unified consideration to the question of Sabbath observance.

The Permanent Committee of the Assembly presented the fruitlessness of their efforts in this direction to the ASSEMBLY of 1883:

"A difficulty that stares us in the face is the want of a cooperative movement on the part of the different denominations of the country. In accordance with the direction of former Assemblies, your Committee have opened correspondence with several of these different Christian denominations. Though our communications have uniformly been received with the greatest courtesy, and in some instances corresponding committees have been appointed, yet we regret not yet to be able to report any tangible, practical result. How this cooperative movement is to be secured in the present divided state of religious sentiment is a problem of difficult solution." (AM-1883-87)

The succeeding years saw the organization of the "American Sabbath Union," as a result of the efforts put forth in behalf of inter-denominational activities in an attempt to preserve the Sabbath Day. (AM-1889-620,622)

The present day difficulties and problems of coordination of creed and practice along this line are presented by the current organization through which the CHURCH works, "The Lord's Day Alliance of the United States." Fortunately we have access to a pamphlet entitled "Plan, Purpose, and Programme of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States," from which a

statement of the nature and workings of the Alliance, as presented by the President, Dr. David G. Wylie, may be obtained. We cannot do better than to quote those sections of this tract which are pertinent to an understanding of the problem before us:

" I. The Alliance

"The Lord's Day Alliance of the United States is a national, interdenominational organization representing, officially, nineteen communions. Its purpose is to secure as far as possible, a day of rest and worship for our citizens."

" IV. The Church and the Day of Rest

.....

"The Alliance seeks to serve both the Church and the State."

" V. Legislative Policy

"It is not the policy of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States to initiate State legislation, but to render assistance in every legitimate way to groups of citizens who are deprived of a day of rest and who seek to obtain a law guaranteeing one. Such assistance has been rendered to postal men, customs guards, poultry men, butchers, tailors, actors, and others.

"The Alliance urges all good citizens to watch carefully proposed legislation in order to secure legislation that is constructive in its character. Also, the National Alliance seeks to render assis-

tance to State Alliances and affiliated societies in every possible way, and in the interest of harmony, requests the State Alliances and affiliated Societies to submit proposed legislative bills dealing with Sunday, prior to introduction into legislatures; and where this is done, the Alliance is ready to give counsel and advice, and when desired, will send a representative, or representatives to take part in and speak at hearings before legislative committees."

The CHURCH is one of the nineteen communions which are represented in the Alliance, and mentioned in the first section above (The action of the 1928 Assembly in regard to relations with the Alliance, as embodied in the ^{recommendations of} Report of the Foreign Relations Committee: "1. That we continue our relation with the Lord's Day Alliance."--AM-1828-75).

The "Legislative Policy" of the Alliance is, of course, at utter variance with the teachings of the Southern Presbyterian Church as regards the nature and function of the Church of Christ. The organization is in reality a body delegated with the doing of the political work of the CHURCH in connection with legislation touching the Sabbath Day. What the CHURCH cannot do, because of the command of its Lord, is secured through an association in which the Southern Church is officially represented, in whose policies that Church has a part in formulating.

The statement of a recent Moderator of the ASSEMBLY, that

The Lord's Day Alliance (in respect to the principle of the Spirituality of the Church) is "on the line," must be regarded as a very charitable one. As a matter of fact, the Southern Presbyterian Church has unnaturally and unconstitutionally invaded the sphere of Caesar by its present connection with that politico-religious organization.

Let it not be supposed that the entire membership of the ASSEMBLY is blind to the real situation in regard to the connection of the Church with the Alliance. Overtures are continually made to the Assembly to withdraw from the association. The action of the 1928 Assembly was related in the "Christian Observer" (May 30th, 1928):

"Although overtures were before the Assembly asking the withdrawal of the Assembly from all connection with the Lord's Day Alliance, the Assembly voted to continue its connection with the Alliance and approved its purpose of defending the Sabbath."

It is not strictly correct to say that the Assembly voted "to continue its connection with the Alliance," however; for a very important change was effected in the status of the Alliance insofar as the Assembly was concerned. The Court did give the Alliance its half-hearted approbation, but failed to seal that benediction by appropriating any funds for the work of the religious law-makers. In former years the proceeds of a special offering taken in the Churches of the Assembly, on the last Sunday in November, have been divided between "Protestant Relief in Europe" and "The Lord's Day Alliance," on the basis

of 80% for Protestant Relief, and 20% for the Alliance. (AM³ 1927-43) The Assembly of 1928 took no action as to the participation of the Alliance in the offering to be taken thus in 1928. The gifts for that year were, on the other hand, designated in their entirety (so far as the Assembly was concerned) to the former cause. (AM-1928-75)

(2) Probable Violations of the Principle of Spirituality

Attention will now be directed to certain actions of the General Assembly in which there is evidence of a transgression of the principle of Spirituality as taught by the CHURCH. This classification, however, differs from that which has just been considered, in that there is difficulty in saying positively and certainly that each instance is beyond all controversy an offence against the idea of Spirituality.

In 1908 a deliverance was made by the High Court on the subject of Child Labor. After a notice of the evils of the system in general, it was resolved:

"That we call upon Christian employers and Christian parents to obey the laws that have been enacted on this subject and to strive after more effective laws to the end that the exploitation of childhood within our boundaries shall be ended." (AM-1908-19)

In this particular instance, it was possible for the reviewer to interview the minister who sponsored the resolution before the Assembly, and thus to secure his statement of the bearing of the paper in question upon the matter of Spirituality.

^a
This gentleman, one of the ablest thinkers of the CHURCH of today, and ex-Moderator of the Assembly, held that the Assembly will commend a principle, but not legislation based on that principle--that it is legitimate for the Assembly to urge the passage of laws intended to secure certain general ends, so long as no specific method or particular measure is specified. This does not appear to the writer to be entirely satisfactory as an explanation, but that may be because of his inability to think through the entire mannerth rightly.

Futhermore, there is another aspect in which the foregoing declaration is at variance with a prior declaration of the Assembly. As we have already noted, the Assembly of 1883 laid down the principle that

"it is not competent for the Church, in its organic capacity to seek the intervention of civil powers for the accomplishment of any of the ends before it, as a witness for the truth of God." (AM-1883-24)

Although the situations in the two instances are admittedly different, yet it would appear that the spirity of the former declaration would be violated by an action of the Assembly, urging its constituents to support the passage of Child Labor laws.

The same principle is involved in an act of the 1890 Assembly, in its dealing with the lottery problem. The concluding paragraph of the Assembly's answer to a communication which had been presented to the body follows:

"We do also declare ourselves in hearty sympathy with all lawful and proper efforts to secure the enactment of such laws by State legislatures, and by the Congress of the United States as will suppress every lottery scheme in the land, and thus protect, as far as possible, our people from the insidious temptation thus set before them." (AM-1890-334)

Such blanket declarations as these can surely be used in support of specific measures coming under the heads which cover the respective matters. Would not such deliverances tend, not only to the support of, but even the initiation of particular bills seeking the protection of childhood, and the suppression of the lottery? At best the idea advanced in support of such actions of the Assembly is dangerous, in that it is quite open to misconstruction.

In 1896 the Assembly ordered:

"That the Permanent Committee on the Sabbath be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary to arrange for securing a united and simultaneous effort on the part of the different denominations of Christians in the United States to get up a mammoth petition to the civil authorities for the enactment and enforcement of laws to stop all unnecessary state and inter-state travel and traffic on the Sabbath day." (AM-1896-614)

The Confession of Faith will be searched in vain for any justification of the CHURCH playing the part of a vast political

organizer, such as seems to have been contemplated in the directions as issued above. (A similar occurrence had taken place in 1881, for practical purposes parallel to this act of 1896-AM-1881-377) In the foregoing year, the Assembly had endorsed the specific object of the associations which it proposed to aid in organizing over the country, in these words (which are self-explanatory):

"3. To present the subject of Sabbath reform to the individual members of our National and State Legislatures, and secure such legislation as will guarantee to all who are directly or indirectly in the employment of our government their constitutional right to a weekly Sabbath rest." (AM-1895-382)

The discussion of such activities has been covered in our treatment of the "Lord's Day Alliance," in a previous section of this chapter.

The campaign for the study and prevention of tuberculosis presents an interesting phase of our topic in hand. It was the Assembly of 1909 that answered a paper dealing with the question of the CHURCH'S endorsement of the movement, through the adopted report of its committee, as follows:

"By reason of the world-wide interest exhibited in the prevention of tuberculosis, which is now recognized as a contagious and preventable disease, and because of the broadly humanitarian character of this work which is engaging the attention of all civic and educational bodies, we would respectfully recommend that the Assembly express its hearty appreciation of the work of the National Association for the study and

prevention of tuberculosis, and endorse the educational propaganda which is now being conducted under its auspices" (AM-1909-55)

It would appear that the Assembly acted without due care in endorsing such propaganda, the future form of which it had no means of knowing, by official decree. The reasons given by the Committee, and endorsed by the Assembly, in support of the body's action in the matter, are somewhat strange ones to be advanced by a court of the Lord Jesus Christ: (1), "the world-wide interest~~ed~~ exhibited in the prevention of tuberculosis;" and (2); "the broadly humanitarian character of this work which is engaging the attention of all civic and educational bodies." That the Church should evince interest in the healing of the bodies of men is not only ~~sharpened~~~~ly~~~~sitting~~ but Christ-like, but that interest should be based on firmer grounds than those given in the above document.

The matter of the display of National flags in church buildings has been touched upon in Chapter Four. The act of the 1920 ASSEMBLY, whereby the Sessions of the several churches were authorized to pass upon the propriety of such demonstrations of patriotism, has resulted in the appearance of Caesar's standards in a very limited number of church buildings. These instances, insofar as they have come under the observance of the writer, are isolated in the extreme; and may usually be traced to ministers who are somewhat erratic so far as the customs and observances of the Southern Presbyterian Church is concerned. The attitude of the ASSEMBLY in giving

on the

license for these displays, naturally places ^A the responsibility for such inharmonious --when measured by the general principles of the CHURCH--demonstrations of loyalty.

It has never been necessary to resort to such practices to prove the devotion of Southern Presbyterians, as citizens, to the government under which they were living. A very limited acquaintance with the facts of the past is ample grounds for a realization that they have ever been foremost in defence of what they considered to be the just authority exercised over them by civil government.

The necessity of touching upon this point is not desirable from the point of view of one who loves the CHURCH. Far better were it possible to apply the words of Woodrow: "There never was a pair of colours at any conventicle."

Thus an attempt has been made to list the several instances in which the ASSEMBLY has taken action in such ways as to visibly contravene the principle of conduct laid down in the creed of the CHURCH. In each instance reasons have been noted for believing that discrepancies exist; though for a final appraisal of these facts, it is impossible to improve upon the injunction of the commentator, who, when confronted with the task of interpreting the "Trumpet passages" in Revelation, wrote: "Let the reader judge for himself."

(3) Apparent Deviations from Principle

It is now with that class of deeds which falsely appear to violate the CHURCH'S idea of Spirituality that we are concerned. Several matters based upon the idea of petition to

civil authorities will be considered in the beginning of this section.

The Minutes of the Second General Assembly (1862) relate the recommendation made by the Committee on Bills and Overtures that "a letter be sent to the President of the Confederacy protesting against ~~the~~less military violation of the Sabbath.

(AM-1862-16)

Dr. Alexander, in a note on page 341 of the 1887 edition of his "Digest," expresses the opinion that the letter which the Committee presented, was adopted by the Assembly and forwarded to President Davis. The heart of the communication was expressed in these paragraphs:

"The Assembly have learned with regret that it is not uncommon for the military arrangements of the Sabbath to be of such a nature as seriously to interfere with the observance of public worship.

"The General Assembly would therefore respectfully request your Excellency to use your influence and authority as Commander-in-chief of the Army, to do away with dress parades, inspections, reviews, or unnecessary movements of troops on the Sabbath, and also to see that the officers shall not interfere with the observance of religious services, but on the contrary, afford proper religious facilities for the same." (AM-1862-16ff)

Not only is the foregoing an exercise of a constitutional right on the part of the Assembly (Confession of Faith XXXI, IV),

but it furnishes an impressive insight into the spirit motivating that body of holy men of God, who, even in those days of sore trial, were not forgetful of the claims of the Lord upon the time and attention of His people. Those who have witnessed the reckless disregard in which the Sabbath has been held in these latter days by the Army find a strange contrast in the witness borne by that Assembly to the claims of Jehovah upon His own.

Not only the churchly, but the secular historian, as well, will find an act of the Assembly of the next year (1863) of interest. On this occasion the subject under discussion was that of transmitting of mail on the Sabbath day by the authorities of the Confederate Government. Col. J. T. L. Preston, a commissioner to the Assembly, presented a resolution which assumed the form of a testimony against this practice, and a petition to the Government to "put away from the nation this cause of Divine anger."

Omitting the preamble, the paper, which was unanimously adopted, reads:

"Resolved, That this General Assembly, representing the views and wishes of an important branch of the Christian Church, lifts its voice in earnest testimony against this form of public and national sin; and in view of God's present dealings with our young nation, in which his hand is so heavy upon us for our sins; implores the legislators of our Land to put away from the nation this cause of Divine anger,

and, by restoring that honor to the Lord's Day which is due to it as the solemn court-day of our Sovereign King, to draw down upon our land that blessing which is promised to those who remember the Sabbath to keep it holy. (The following paragraph deals with communication which it was proposed to establish with other branches of the Church, with the accomplishment of the same end in view) (AM-1863-164ff)

It is in the closing section of the Resolution, however, that interest centers for all who have been thrilled by the exploits of the Confederate "Foot Cavalry" and their peerless commander; for that part of the paper contains a letter which had been addressed to Col. Preston by that Confederate leader who "put the fear of the Lord into the Yankee Generals." On April 27, 1863, General Thomas J. Jackson, far better known by the nick-name given him by Bee at the First Battle of Manassas, wrote:

"Dear Colonel: I am much gratified to see that you are one of the delegates to the General Assembly of our Church, and I write to express the hope that something may be accomplished by you at the meeting of that influential body towards repealing the law requiring our mails to be carried on the Christian Sabbath. Recently I received a letter from a member of Congress, expressing the hope that the House of Representatives would act upon the subject during its present session; and from the mention made of

Col. Chilton and Mr. Curry, of Alabama, I infer that they are members of the committee which recommended the repeal of the law. A few days since I received a very gratifying letter from Mr. Curry, which was entirely voluntary on his part, as I was a stranger to him, and there had been no previous correspondence between us. His letter is of a cheering character, and he takes occasion to say that divine laws can be violated with impunity neither by governments nor individuals. I regret to say that he is fearful that the anxiety of members to return home, and the press of other business, will prevent the desired action at this session. I have said thus much in order that you may see that congressional action is to be looked for at the next Congress, and hence the importance that Christians act promptly, so that our legislators may see the current of public opinion before they take up the subject. I hope and pray that such may be our country's sentiment upon this and kindred subjects, that our statesmen will see their way clearly. Now appears to me an auspicious time for action, as our people are looking to God for assistance."

Before one week had passed from the time these lines were written, that Mighty Man of God had fallen victim to the frightful mistake on the night of the Battle of Chancellorsville (May 2); and on the 10th of May he passed from the membership of the

Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America into the fellowship of the Church of the Firstborn in the heavenly Jerusalem.

The same paragraph of the Confession, dealing with petition to the civil authorities, bears upon the actions of various Assemblies in treating the matter of arbitration of international disputes. (AM-1890-18,53--1891-242--1893-51--1894-203) These efforts, begun at the instigation of Rev. W. A. Campbell, D. D., were among the beginnings of the great movement, insofar as the Churches were concerned. In fact the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church seems to have been the initiator of the ecclesiastical strivings for world peace. We read in the Minutes of the Assembly of 1892:

"This ecclesiastical movement in behalf of international arbitration, inaugurated by our Assembly, has met with the hearty endorsement of leading men in all the branches of the church, and of prominent statesmen." (page 422)

The care evidenced to avoid transgression by the CHURCH in overstepping the boundaries which separate her from the civil government is manifest by the manner in which "A Petition to be Addressed to the Several Governments of the Christian Nations of the World" is concluded. This document, as drawn up by Dr. Campbell, was adopted by the ASSEMBLY during the first of those years when the matter of arbitration was under consideration. After a review of the horrors of war, together with

a reminder of its futility in the settlement of international disputes, followed by a notation of an individual instance in which arbitration had resulted in the happy settlement of an important international question, the paper reads:

"As to the method of accomplishing this end, we make no suggestions, but leave that to your superior intelligence and wisdom in matters of State policy."

(AM-1890-18ff)

Truly a most politic, as well as churchly procedure !

A pertinent and lucid comment upon the relation of the peace movement as a whole to politics, is to be found in a recent issue of the "Christian Observer." Dr. D. P. McGeachy, a minister of the Southern Presbyterian Church, writes:

"It is natural (and right) for one in our particular branch of the Church to ask whether this problem of peace and war is not a purely political detail and therefore to be left to the statesman and politician. The correct answer to that inquiry is that peace propaganda is not political. There may be political phases of it but with those we as a Church have nothing to do." ("Christian Observer"--Feb 29, 1928)

In 1903 quite justifiable steps were taken by the Assembly for securing a fair civil trial for two missionaries of the CHURCH who were under indictment in the Congo. (AM-1903-504-- In connection with this same case a related act of the Assembly has been considered in a previous section of this chapter)

Two occasions fall under review in which the Assembly extended thanks to a President of the United States for action previously taken by the Executive. The first of these appreciations was prompted by measures taken by President Cleveland, in 1892, to securing the closing of the gates of the Columbian Exposition, at Chicago, on the Sabbath day. (AM-1893-40) The second expression was called forth, in 1913, when President Wilson ordered the White House closed to Sunday visitors, and by his "discouraging social and State functions on the Lord's Day." (AM-1913-69)

These acts of the ASSEMBLY were authorized by the Constitution of the Church as necessary inferences from the law, as contained in Chapter XXXI of the Confession of Faith. The Assembly of 1881 (AM-1881-390) had declared that "All just and necessary consequences from the law of the Church are a part of the same, in the logical sense of being implicitly contained therein." The authority to petition necessarily implies the authorization of the rendering of an expression of thanks to that person or body to whom the petition might be presented. The right to thank the Executive Officer is a corollary from the law of the Confession concerning petitions.

When General Thomas J. Jackson ("Stonewall") died, in 1863, the Assembly entered a minute upon his death. This action was later criticized as unbecoming that Court. (AM-1908-Report of ad interim Committee on Documents-19ff) Whether the criticism was based on the reference to General Jackson per se, or had been inspired by the manner in which the reference was made is

not clear. Probably the identifying of the Assembly with the forces of the Confederacy was the basis of objection. This is certainly done in the sentence, "The rapidity of his movements, imparting to him a seeming ubiquity, the promptness and daring and uniform success of his achievements, rendered his name a terror to our foes, and a tower of strength to ourselves."

It is quite likely that the wording of the document might have been improved upon from the standpoint of the doctrine of Spirituality; but whatever the shortcomings of the expression, no one would ever dream of questioning the truthfulness of its statements. Let it also be remembered that it was only natural for the Assembly to take more than passing notice of the passing of the great Chieftain; that he was a devoted member of the CHURCH, as well as a mighty warrior.

In 1917, 1918, 1921 the Assembly sent communications to President, and in the last instance ex-President, Wilson. In none of these instances was the message of a partisan nature, but rather of greeting to a brother in Christ, addressed to one who had been born and reared in the manse of the Church. An indication of the attachment of President Wilson to the Church of his forefathers, is to be found in the fact that upon his removal to Washington to assume the duties of the highest office in the land, he chose as his place of worship the Central Presbyterian Church, of the Synod of Virginia.

The significant fact demonstrated in the class of incidents related above, is the intelligent manner in which the CHURCH has been guided by her doctrine of Spirituality.

Too frequently supposed principles are applied in cases in which they have no bearing. The idea of the Spirituality of the Church has been greatly cherished by the ASSEMBLY, while, at the same time, incisive insight has been shown in dealing with situations in which the duty of the Church may be reconciled with its Spirituality, even though a conflict may be apparent on the surface.

Writing of the situation a score of years after those stirring events which took place in the Scottish Church in 1843, P. C. Simpson remarks ("Life of Principal Rainy"-163):

"It has to be frankly admitted that, in the twenty years that had elapsed since the great act of 1843, there had grown up, in sections of the Free Church, a kind of worship of the Disruption."

The presence of an analogous^{spirit} in the Southern Presbyterian Church in regard to the Doctrine of Spirituality has never made itself known. True there have been differences of opinion in connection with the interpretation and application of the fundamental principles, but the tendency to bow down before the abstract idea of such Separatism has never been found. The position taken by the CHURCH in such matters has, in short, proved to be, not only an excellent one in theory, but in its actual application to the problems arising in the life of the Church, the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church has abundantly vindicated itself as a thing of usefulness and profit.

Transgressions of Lower Courts of the Church

The foregoing records tell an exhaustive story of the workings of the Assembly in those instances where the principle of Spirituality is to be taken into account. It is manifestly impossible to enter into any similar review of the minutes of the subordinate courts of the CHURCH, and fortunately, such an undertaking is unnecessary; since it is from the Assembly that declarations of a binding character and precedents authorized for example must come. The acts of two of the Synods will, by way of illustration, be noticed.

The Synod of South Carolina, in session on December, 11th, 1860 (Nine days before the secession of that State), gave utterance officially to a statement of the Church's duty in the matter of abstinence from political declaration, which in its opening sentences was thoroughly in accord with the later views of the CHURCH, which was soon to be organized. The blood of the citizen rose stronger than that of the churchman in the latter part of the deliverance, however; and we find that the belief of the Synod is expressed^{as} calling upon the people of South Carolina to "imitate their revolutionary forefathers and stand up for their rights." (Jones-"Presbyterian Church in South Carolina")

North Carolina, as usual, was not to be outdone. In November of the following year (1861), that Synod, meeting at Raleigh, the State capital, resolved:

"2 That the Synod, set and appointed by her Divine Head as a witness for the right and for truth, truly sympathizes with the State and with the Con-

federate States in their present righteous struggle, and cordially approves their action in asserting and maintaining their sovereignty and severing the ties that bound us and them to the late United States of America." (Craig-"Development of the Presbyterian Church in North Carolina"-31)

Spirituality and Individuals

Three instances of personal divergence from the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church will bring us to the close of this chapter. The individuals involved in these transactions were outstanding leaders in the work of the CHURCH in the first two cases, while the present-day example is that of a man who is among the foremost preachers of the United States.

David Caldwell, minister in North Carolina during the wars with Britain, was a school-master, farmer, and physician extraordinary. Though he entered the ministry at the age of forty, his term of service was a lengthy one; for, having served as pastor of Buffalo and Alamance Churches for sixty years, he died at the ripe age of five score. He must have been an unusual sort of parson, for, at one time, the British had a reward of two hundred pounds on his head.

In the course of the War of 1812, when considerable difficulty was encountered in securing the requisite number of volunteers for the American Army from his parish, Dr. Caldwell, by request, addressed the people in the court house. It may

have been that he intended acting as a citizen, but it was as preacher that he spoke. When he had finished preaching from the text, "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one," the desired recruits were immediately enlisted. (Foote-"Sketches of North Carolina"-241) It must have been a "successful" political sermon.

No less strange person than Dr. B. M. Palmer is the subject of our next reference. The incident is that of his Thanksgiving Sermon, delivered on November, 29, 1860, in New Orleans. After calling the congregation to bear witness to his silence in the past on political matters, he declared that the hour had come when "whoever may have influence to shape public opinion....must lend it, or prove faithless to a trust as solemn as any to be accounted for at the bar of God." ("Life of B. M. Palmer"-206) Here we have an instance of a great man carried away by the fervor of the impending war and the spirit of turmoil abroad in the land.

Dr. James I. Vance, of Nashville, Tennessee, Moderator of the ASSEMBLY of 1918, furnishes the final illustration of the matter in hand. Writing in the "Homiletic Review" of July, 1924, he tells of the part played by men of his congregation, under his own leadership, in civic and civil affairs:

"Recently in Nashville from the pulpit I invited such members of the First Presbyterian Church as were willing to meet me at the church and go in a body to the City Council and insist on a law closing gasoline filling stations on Sunday. This

visitation was made on four successive nights. The invitation assembled sufficient voters to fill the Council chamber. The law is now in successful operation." (8)

The insertion of these incidents is intended to illustrate the fact that there is, and has been, a variety of opinion as to how the churchman should act in conformity to the principles underlying the participation of the Church in civil affairs. As has already been indicated, it is extremely likely, that Dr. Palmer was untrue to his usual ideas and ideals when he preached his famous political sermon. Dr. Vance simply differs as to the extent to which the Church should, or should not, participate in the affairs of government.

Chapter Seven tells the other side of the story--a record of those occasions on which the CHURCH failed to rise to the heights marked out for her by the system of doctrine concerning the Spirituality of the Church:

1. Three lists of actions are classified; the first of which contains such acts of the Assembly as may be definitely said to contradict the CHURCH'S doctrine. Next follow certain proceedings in which there was a probable violation of the Spiritual principle. The third group deals with those matters in which an apparent failure to act in accord with the CHURCHLY idea of Spirituality may be explained as being in keeping with the ideal.
2. Two instances in which the neighboring Synods of North and South Carolina were forgetful of the CHURCH'S admonition to confine their declarations to the things of God, or have disregarded such teachings and precedents, are noted.
3. A trio of prominent figures in widely different ages of the CHURCH'S history demonstrate how the individual may deviate from the Doctrine of Spirituality as taught by the CHURCH.

With these words the last record is entered, and there remains only a brief general summary of conclusions drawn from the pages of this work. The following, and closing, section will attempt an appraisal of that which has gone before.

CONCLUSIONS

CONCLUSIONS

The end of these pages is near. But, while it is necessary to bring these records to a close, that Glorious Church goes down into the future years, that those who run may read her story of witness for a great truth of God. Ordained by her omnipotent Lord that she might testify to the Spiritual nature and mission of His Church on earth, she faces the future of a new day with that confidence which comes from Him Whom she has long acknowledged as the Sole King in Zion.

The years have not served to dim the lustre of her glory; time has only lent emphasis to the importance of the message which this Church has for the World. More and more men are coming to realize that "the Church is a spiritual commonwealth," the power of which is "exclusively spiritual." Born in those days which tried the religion, as well as the souls, of men, the Presbyterian Church in the United States has lived to see "the day break and the shadows flee." The seventy thousand of 1861 have, by the grace of God, increased more than six fold; that last command, "Go ye into all the world," which the First Assembly desired "distinctly and deliberately to inscribe" on the Church's banner, has realized itself in four hundred and sixty-four Foreign Missionaries, who represent the Church in that great spiritual warfare in which she is engaged. If the blessings of God be an indication of His approbation, surely the Communion has been sealed with the earnest of the inheritance of the Lord of Hosts.

A summary of conclusions is, at this point, necessary; for a review of those things which have been ascertained will form a fitting ending for our consideration of a great principle

in the doctrine and life of a great Church::

1. The Southern Presbyterian Church was organized as a result of, and as a protest against, the deciding of a political question by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Old-school). (This statement is to be understood in the light of the First Section of the "Address to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth.")

The manner in which the General Assembly of 1861 outreached its commission, by the passage of the Gardiner Spring Resolution, has been evidenced in the Second Chapter of this paper. The tremendous emphasis placed upon the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church by the First Assembly of the CHURCH, the opening sermon of that Assembly, together with the "Address to the Churches," indicate how vital this principle was regarded by those who constituted that First High Court. In the language of the "Pastoral Letter to the Churches" of 1870, "Upon this very issue we have become an organized church."

If it be interrupted that the separation of the Northern and Southern branches of the Presbyterian Church was inevitable upon the outbreak of the War, it is only necessary to remind the objector of the words of Him Who, in the long ago, in speaking of such matters, exclaimed, "Woe unto that man by whom offences come."

2. The continued existence of the Southern Presbyterian Church as a separate organization owes much to the loyalty of that body to the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church.

Dr. Thomas Carey Johnson, of whom Dr. H. R. Mackintosh recently said, that, although, he disagreed with Dr. Johnson

on certain matters of faith, he had nothing to say as to the system of belief that could produce such a man, has written:

"No church has a right to an independent existence which has not a truth or group of truth to witness for which other churches in the country do not witness for." ("American Church History Series"--"Southern Presbyterians"--479) This, as has been shown in Chapter Five, is the historic position taken by the CHURCH in matters relating to organic union, especially as regards the formation of that bond with the brethren of the Northern Presbyterian Church.

3. The Southern Presbyterian Church has a clear and unified Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church, which has often been expressed, both as an entity and in its several parts, by the Church, and by her teachers. "The Address to the Churches" furnishes the classic deliverance on this subject. Chapter Three is a related summary of such utterances as have been called forth, from time to time, in regard to the relations of the Church to the State, and of the Civil Body to that of Christ.

4. The General Assembly of the CHURCH has never, deliberately and consciously, violated the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church in an official deliverance; and at times when the Doctrine suffered in application at the hands of that body, the High Court was profuse in its expression of loyalty to the principle.

The former portion of the above assertion is a conclusion reached by the negative approach of a search of the Assembly's Minutes, which failed to bring forth an instance in which that Court was guilty of a premeditated transgression of the distinc-

tive tenet of the CHURCH. The facts leading to the latter statement are recorded in the Chapter entitled, "The Discord of Creed and Conduct."

5. All negotiations concerning organic union with other bodies have been conditioned upon the Principle of the Spirituality of the Church, either expressed or implied.

The basis for such a remark is to be found in that portion of this work, dealing with church union, which is designated, "Spirituality in Church Union and Ecclesiastical Affiliation." Needless to say, as in the case of Proposition Two, this truth is best illustrated by the transactions between the CHURCH and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

6. The general practice of the CHURCH has been to regulate her official acts in accord with the Doctrine of Spirituality as she interprets it.

Here we have recourse to Chapter Six, for examples from which the above rule was induced, together with Chapter Seven, which makes such induction well-nigh complete.

7. The sporadic violations of her doctrine by the acts of the General Assembly of the CHURCH constitute exceptions to a general rule, rather than any fundamental departure therefrom.

Dr. Johnson has well expressed this idea, when he wrote: "It thus appears that if the Southern Presbyterian Church has faltered in her testimony for the non-secular character of the Church, her falterings have been transient inconsistencies." ("American Church History Series"--"Southern Presbyterians"-434) Testimony is borne to this opinion by the manner in which the Assembly has affirmed loyalty to principle even while engaged in

the violation thereof (Proposition 4 above; Chapter Seven); and by that notable act of the Assemblies of 1875 and 1876, which characterized such inconsistencies as forming no "part of the well-considered, authoritative teaching or testimony of our Church." (Chapter Six)

8. The Southern Presbyterian Church has, in several instances, definitely violated the Principle of Spirituality which she professes, by the official acts of the General Assembly.

This proposition is treated in the closing Chapter of the body of the thesis, "The Discord of Creed and Conduct." No apology need be attempted for such deeds. The CHURCH is not infallible; and such instances simply represent failure to attain to the ideal which has been set by that body for herself.

9. The position of the Southern Presbyterian Church has remained practically unchanged upon this Doctrine throughout the years of her history (Relations with the "Lord's Day Alliance" and the "Federal Council of Churches" advise the use of the modifier "practically.")

This statement is made after a study of this paper in which the dates connected with the various incidents were noted.

10. The Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church is the distinctive characteristic of the Southern Presbyterian Church. When Dr. W. L. Lingle, the beloved teacher, came to list the differentiating features of his Church, in 1928, he began with: "A firm conviction that the mission of the church is entirely spiritual, and in no sense political." ("Presbyterians"--163) We have seen how Dr. Johnson places such emphasis on this article of the CHURCH'S doctrine (Above, Proposition 2), in assigning

it the foremost place in the very existence of the Communion. The whole of this paper is a record of the importance which Southern Presbyterians have, and do attach to the Principle of Spirituality. The members of this Church are "Separatists" in a new sense and in a new age, "Puritans" in the matter of distinction between the things of Caesar and the affairs of God.

With entire justice, the whole matter may be summarized by saying that the Southern Presbyterian Church has attained to the ultimate expression of the Presbyterian Doctrine of the provinces of the Church and of the State. What Presbyterians in other lands, and of other ages, have groped for throughout the years, she, by the grace of God, has been able to attain. Whatever may be the defects in that system of Spirituality which the CHURCH has worked and lived out, it appears to be more nearly that of the New Testament than is the teaching of the other Churches.

And, furthermore, it is apparent that the practice of the Southern Presbyterian Church represents the ultimate application of this most advanced Presbyterian theory. Sometimes faltering, never faultless, yet always striving to reach that far-off goal of a perfect church, without spot or blemish, or any such thing, The Presbyterian Church in the United States presses forward toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Spirituality in the Future and the Future of Spirituality

The Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church has greatly influenced the history of the Southern Presbyterian Church. The devotion of that body to such teachings still stands firm. What of the future of Spirituality?

Church union is the field in which it is most likely that the Doctrine of Spirituality will be called on to assert and vindicate itself in the days to come. We have noted the efforts made toward organic union between the Northern and Southern Churches, as such efforts concerned the matter of Separation. In 1918, it appeared that such union was not unlikely; today, such a combination appears far removed; but that may be but for a season.

Let us frankly face the question of the Future of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church in event of such a union being consummated.

The "Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth" listed three reasons for the separation of the Church: (1), The political activities of the General Assembly; (2), The advisability of churches confined within national lines; and (3), The diverse attitudes of the Northern and Southern sections of the Church on the question of slavery. The Second of these arguments no longer exists; the Third has been eliminated insofar as its original form is concerned, though it must be borne in mind that there is, today, a great difference in the way in which the Negro Problem is viewed by the Northern and Southern Churches. The variant ideas as to the sphere of the Church's work alone remains in the form in which the "Address" presented the three propositions.

The Southern Church has not changed its doctrine, nor--- what is more important---its practice in connection with the ascription of the things of civil government to Caesar. The U. S. A. Church takes a widely different position in this matter---again, in the field of practice. The Gardiner Spring Res-

olution still stands. Though having made wide excursions into the political world in the days of the Civil War, the Northern Church has strangely shown a total lack of appreciation of the political problem confronting that generation. How can two walk together except they be agreed? Under such circumstances, what would be the effect of organic union between the two bodies upon the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church?

The Churches hold the same system of doctrine in regard to the separation of Church and State, so there should be no difficulty, it may be said. The Federal Council of Churches, while openly violating the whole teaching of Spirituality, "clearly" affirmed its "adherence to the absolute separation of Church and State," and expressed the conviction that "with a proper understanding of the situation, there is no real line of cleavage between the principles of the Presbyterian Church in the United States and the Constitution of the Federal Council." (Chapter Five) It is a matter, not only of creed, but of interpretation of that creed.

The fate of the minority is hard. To a union between the Northern and Southern Presbyterian Churches the Northern Church would contribute approximately two million members, while that of the South would furnish less than one-half million (1928 figures). It requires neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet to anticipate the result insofar as the Doctrine of Spirituality is concerned---the ideas of the North would prevail; the testimony of the Southern Church would be merged into that of the far larger body, like the waters of the tributary as they mingle with the stream of a mighty river.

The testimony of the minority is unavailing. Surely that costly teacher by the name of Experience has convinced the CHURCH of this truth, in its dealings with the Federal Council. Moreover, the testimony of the General Assembly of a Presbyterian Church is a very different sort of sound from that of a fractional part of such an ecclesiastical body, who, when they raise their voices in advocacy of any doctrine or principle, are usually accused of being chronic complainers to whom nothing could be satisfactory. The privilege of separate and distinct testimony is a valuable one, and ought not to be surrendered while there is truth worthy of testimony. If, as the Church has often claimed, The Southern Presbyterian Church has been raised up by God as a special witness for the great Principle of the Spirituality of the Church, can a move be justified which robs the body of its power of testimony to that truth?

The insistence of the CHURCH upon agreement along the line of Spirituality has been a sine qua non of all organic union. (Proposition Five) This historic policy still forbids the uniting of the Southern Church with any other body which does not agree in the matter of the relations of the Church and State.

Let the matter be squarely faced. If it be that the principle for which our fathers suffered and testified, and upon which they based the right of the Southern Presbyterian Church to come into being as a separate body, has had its day and ceased to be, then we may neglect the matter in considering our future relations with those bodies which do not agree with us concerning the Doctrine of Spirituality.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States is the Steward, in an especial sense, of the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church. It is required of stewards that they be found faithful. "Truth is more precious than union;" fidelity more praiseworthy than compromise. Unto us much has been committed; of us much will be required. God grant that the Spirit of Light may be our guide along every path over which this cherished truth may lead the CHURCH, and enable her to stand before her Lord at last, as one who has been faithful to these things committed to her earthly trust !

Thus ends a record of the lights and shadows of well nigh three score years and ten. Though much there has been of labor and sorrow, the hand of the Lord has been upon the CHURCH for good. Today she stands in all the vigor of youth, yet tempered by the vicissitudes and trials of the past, she bears her part right nobly in the burden and heat of the day.

We have sketched her history from those dark days of strife, when her birth followed soon upon that of the Confederacy which she was destined by far to outlive. Some account of the First General Assembly has been interwoven with a notice of her greatest document, "The Address to All the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth." The teachings of the CHURCH on Spirituality have been explored, while the acts grounded on those doctrines have passed in review. The instances wherein there was failure to regulate conduct in accord with that high creed have not escaped note; while the whole has resolved itself into a noble picture of a beloved branch of the Church of Christ.

The CHURCH is a part of much that she has met. Purified by the flames of affliction in her earliest years, the refined gold has shone out over the span of a useful life. Initiated by officers who "wore swords that had been seasoned in the wars," this denomination has fought right valiantly for the cause of the Prince of Peace. Those who yield to her allegiance cannot but feel that the best is yet to be, that the morning-tide of life "gives promise of a glorious day."

When some chronicler of the coming age has finished the story of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the reader must needs be impressed by the tremendous part which the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church has played in the history of that body; and when the final account of her deeds is entered in the chronicles of the Great King, in the Celestial City, it will be with Divine benediction upon her, for the part which she has played, in the Church Militant, as witness for the Doctrine of the Spirituality of the Church.

(The end)

APPENDIX

ADDRESS TO ALL THE CHURCHES OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGHOUT THE EARTH

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, to all the Churches of Jesus Christ throughout the Earth, Greeting: Grace, mercy and peace be multiplied upon you !

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN:

It is probably known to you that the Presbyteries and Synods in the Confederate States, which were formerly in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, have renounced the jurisdiction of that body, and dissolved the ties which bound them ecclesiastically with their brethren of the North. This act of separation left them without any formal union among themselves. But as they were one in faith and order, and still adhered to their old Standards, measures were promptly adopted for giving expression to their unity, by the organization of a supreme court, upon the model of the one whose authority they had just relinquished. Commissioners, duly appointed, from all the Presbyteries of these Confederate States, met accordingly, in the city of Augusta, on the fourth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-one, and then and there proceeded to constitute the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, that is to say, the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, the Form of Government, the Book of Discipline, and the Directory of Worship, were unanimously and solemnly declared to be the Constitution of the Church in the Confederate States, with no other change than the substitution of Confederate for United wherever the country is mentioned in the Standards. The Church, therefore, in these seceded States, presents now the spectacle of a separate and independent and complete organization, under the style and title of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America. In thus taking its place among sister churches of this and other countries, it seems proper that it should set forth the causes which have impelled it to separate from the Church of the North, and to indicate a general view of the course which it feels is incumbent upon it to pursue in the new circumstances in which it is placed.

We should be sorry to be regarded by our brethren in any part of the world as guilty of schism. We are not conscious of any purpose to rend the body of Christ. On the contrary, our aim has been to promote the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. If we have known our own hearts, and can form any just estimate of the motives which have governed us, we have been prompted by a sincere desire to promote the glory of God, and the efficiency, energy, harmony and zeal of His visible kingdom in the earth. We have separated from our breth-

ren of the North as Abraham separated from Lot, because we are persuaded that the interests of the true religion will be more effectually subserved by two independent churches, under the circumstances in which the two countries are placed, than by one united body:

1. In the first place, the course of the last Assembly at Philadelphia, conclusively shows that, if we should remain together, the political questions which divide us as citizens will be obtruded on our church courts, and discussed by Christian ministers and elders with all the acrimony, bitterness and rancor with which such questions are usually discussed by men of the world. Our Assembly would present a mournful spectacle of strife and debate. Commissioners from the Northern would meet with commissioners from the Southern Confederacy, to wrangle over the questions which have split them into two confederacies, and involved them in furious and bloody war. They would denounce each other, as the ~~enemies~~ ^{enemies} hand, ~~rascals~~ ^{rascals} tyrants and oppressors, and on the other, as traitors and rebels. The Spirit of God would take His departure from these scenes of confusion, and leave the Church lifeless and powerless, an easy prey to the sectional divisions and angry passions of its members. Two nations, under any circumstances except those of perfect homogeneousness, cannot be united in one Church without the rigid exclusion of all civil and secular questions from its halls. Where the countries differ in their customs and institutions, and ~~stew each other with~~ ^{stew each other with} an eye of jealousy and rivalry, if national feelings are permitted to enter the church courts, there must be an end of harmony and peace. The prejudice of the man and the citizen will prove stronger than the charity of the Christian. When they have allowed themselves to denounce each other for their national peculiarities, it will be hard to join in cordial fellowship as members of the same spiritual family. Much more must this be the case where the nations are not simply rivals, but enemies--when they hate each other with a cruel hatred, when they are engaged in a ferocious and bloody war, and when the worst passions of human nature are stirred to their very depths. An Assembly composed of representatives from two such countries would have no security for peace, except in a steady, uncompromising adherence to the Scriptural principle, that it would know no man after the flesh; that it would abolish the distinctions of Barbarian, Scythian, bond and free, and recognize nothing but the new creature in Christ Jesus. The moment it permits itself to know the Confederate or the United States, the moment its members meet as citizens of these countries, our political differences will be transferred to the house of God, and the passions of the forum will expel the spirit of holy love and of Christian communion.

We cannot condemn a man in one breath as unfaithful to the most solemn earthly interests--his country and his race--and commend him in the next as a loyal and faithful servant of his

God. If we distrust his patriotism, our confidence is apt to be very measured in his piety. The old adage will hold here as in other things, falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus.

¶ 5. The only conceivable condition, therefore, upon which the Church of the North and the South could remain together as one body, with any prospect of success, is the vigorous exclusion of the questions and passions of the forum from its halls of debate. This is what always ought to be done. The provinces of the Church and State are perfectly distinct, and the one has no right to usurp the jurisdiction of the other. The State is a natural institute, founded in the constitution of man as moral and social, and designed to realize the idea of justice. It is the society of rights. The Church is a supernatural institute, founded in the facts of redemption, and is designed to realize the idea of grace. It is the society of the redeemed. The State aims at social order, the Church at spiritual holiness. The State looks to the visible and outward; the Church is concerned for ^{the} invisible and inward. The badge of the State's authority is the sword, by which it becomes a terror to evil doers, and a praise to them that do well; the badge of the Church's authority is the keys, by which it opens and shuts the kingdom of Heaven, according as men are believing or impenitent. The power of the Church is exclusively spiritual; that of the State includes the exercise of force. The constitution of the Church is a divine revelation; the constitution of the State must be determined by human reason and the course of providential events. The Church has no right to construct or modify a government for the State, and the State has no right to frame a creed or polity for the Church. They are as planets moving in different orbits, and unless each is confined to its own track, the consequences may be as disastrous in the moral world as the collision of different spheres in the world of matter. It is true that there is a point in which their respective jurisdictions seem to meet--in the idea of duty. But even duty is viewed by each in very different lights. The Church enjoins it as obedience to God, and the State enforces it as the safeguard of order. But there can be no collision, unless one or the other blunders as to the things that are materially right. When the State makes wicked laws, contradicting the eternal principles of rectitude, the Church is at liberty to testify against them, and humbly to petition that they may be repealed. In like manner, if the Church becomes seditious and a disturber of the peace, the State has a right to abate the nuisance. In ordinary cases, however, there is not likely to be a collision. Among a Christian people there is little difference of opinion as to the radical distinctions of right and wrong. The only serious danger is where moral duty is conditioned upon a political question. Under the pretext of inculcating duty, the Church may usurp the power to determine the questions which conditions it, and that is precisely what she is debarred from doing.

The conditions must be given. She must accept it from the State, and then her own course is clear. If Caesar is your master, then pay tribute to him; but whether the if holds, whether Caesar is your master or not, whether he ever had any just authority, whether he now retains it or has forfeited it, these are points which the Church has no commission to adjudicate.

Had these principles been steadily maintained by the Assembly at Philadelphia, it is possible that the ecclesiastical separation of the North and South might have been deferred for years to come. Our Presbyteries, many of them, clung with tenderness to the recollections of the past. Sacred memories gathered around that venerable Church which had breasted many a storm and trained our fathers for glory. It had always been distinguished for its conservative influence, and many fondly hoped that, even in the present emergency, it would raise its placid and serene head above the tumults of popular passion, and bid defiance to the angry billows which rolled at its feet. We expected it to bow in reverence only at the name of Jesus. Many dreamed that it would utterly refuse to know either Confederates or Federalists, and utterly refuse to give authoritative decree without a "thus saith the Lord." It was ardently desired that the sublime spectacle might be presented of one church upon earth combining in cordial fellowship and in holy love the disciples of Jesus in different and even hostile lands. But, alas ! for the weakness of man, these golden visions were soon dispelled. The first thing which aroused our Presbyteries to look the question of separation in the face was the course of the Assembly in venturing to determine, as a court of Jesus Christ, which it did by necessary implication, the true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States as to the kind of government it intended to form. A political theory was, to all intents and purposes, propounded, which made secession a crime, the seceding States rebellious, and the citizens who obeyed them traitors. We say nothing here as to the righteousness or unrighteousness of these decrees. What we maintain is that, whether right or wrong, the Church had no right to make them; she transcended her sphere, and usurped the duties of the State. The discussion of these questions, we are sorry to add, was in the spirit and temper of partisan disclaimers. The Assembly, driven from its ancient moorings, was tossed to and fro by the waves of popular passion. Like Pilate, it obeyed the clamor of the multitude, and, though acting in the name of Jesus, it kissed the scepter and bowed the knee to the mandates of Northern frenzy. The Church was converted into the forum, and the Assembly was henceforward to become the arena of sectional divisions and national animosities.

We frankly admit that the mere unconstitutionality of the proceedings of the last Assembly is not, in itself considered, a sufficient ground for separation. It is the consequences of these proceedings which make them so offensive. It is the door

which they open for the introduction of the worst passions of human nature into the deliberations of church courts. The spirit of these proceedings, if allowed to prevail, would forever banish peace from the Church, and there is no reason to hope that the tide which has begun to flow can soon be arrested. The two Confederacies hate each other more intensely now than they did in May, and if their citizens should come together upon the same floor, whatever might be the errand that brought them there, they could not be restrained from smiting each other with the fist of wickedness. For the sake of peace, therefore, for Christian charity, for the honor of the Church, and for the glory of God, we have been constrained, as much as in us lies, to remove all cause of offense. We have quietly separated, and we are grateful to God that, while leaving for the sake of peace, we leave it with the humble consciousness that we ourselves have never given occasion to break the peace. We have never confounded Caesar and Christ, and we have never mixed the issues of this world with the weighty matters that properly belong to us as citizens of the kingdom of God.

2. Though the immediate occasion of separation was the course of the General Assembly at Philadelphia in relation to the Federal Government and the war, yet there is another ground on which the independent organization of the Southern Church can be amply and Spiritually maintained. The unity of the Church does not require a formal bond of union among all the congregations of believers throughout the earth. It does not demand a vast imperial monarchy like that of Rome, nor a strictly universal council like that to which the complete development of Presbyterianism would naturally give rise. The Church catholic is one in Christ, but it is not necessarily one visible, all-absorbing organization upon earth. There is no schism where there is no breach of charity. Churches may be perfectly at one in every principle of faith and order, and yet geographically distinct, and mutually independent. As the unity of the human race is not disturbed by its division into countries and nations, so the unity of the spiritual seed of Christ is neither broken nor impaired by separation and division into various church constitutions. Accordingly, in the Protestant countries church organizations have followed national lines. The Calvinistic churches of Switzerland are distinct from the Reformed Church of France. The Presbyterians of Ireland belong to a different church from the Presbyterians of Scotland, and the Presbyterians of this country constitute a church, in like manner, distinct from all other churches on the globe. That division into national churches, that is churches bounded by national lines, is, in the present condition of human nature, a benefit, seems to us too obvious for proof. It realizes to the Church catholic all the advantages of a division of labor. It makes a church organization homogeneous and compact; it stimulates holy rivalry and zeal; it removes all grounds of suspicion and jealousy on the part of the State. What is lost

in expansion is gained in energy. The Church catholic, as thus divided, and yet spiritually one, divided, but not rent, is a beautiful illustration of the great philosophical principle which pervades all nature--the co-existence of the one with the many.

If it is desirable that each nation should contain a separate and an independent church, the Presbyteries of the Confederate States need no apology for bowing to the decree of Providence, which, in withdrawing their country from the government of the United States, has, at the same time, determined that they should withdraw from the Church of their fathers. It is not that they have ceased to love it--not that they have abjured its ancient principles, or forgotten its glorious history. It is to give these same principles a righer, freer, fuller development among ourselves than they possibly could receive under foreign culture. It is precisely because we love that Church as it should be, that we have resolved, as far as in us lies, to realize its grand idea in the country and under the government where God has cast our lot. With the supreme control of ecclesiastical affairs in our hands, we may be able, in some competent measure, to consummate this result. In subjection to a foreign power, we could no more accomplish it than the Church in the United States could have developed in dependence upon the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. The difficulty there would have been, not the distance of Edinburgh from New York, Philadelphia or Charleston, but the difference in the manners, habits, customs and ways of thinking, the social, civil and political institutions of the people. The same difficulties exist in relation to the Confederate and the United States, and render it eminently proper that the Church in each should be as separate and independent as the governments.

(At this point the Address enters upon a discussion of Slavery, which, for the most part, has no relation to our subject. The one paragraph dealing with the relation of Church and State follows.)

In the first place, we would have it distinctly understood that, in our ecclesiastical capacity, we are neither the friends nor the foes of slavery, that is to say, we have no commission either to propagate or abolish it. The policy of its existence or non-existence is a question which exclusively belongs to the State. We have no right, as a Church, to enjoin it as a duty, or to condemn it as a sin. Our business is with the duties which spring from the relation; the duties of the masters on the one hand, and of the slaves on the other. These duties we are to proclaim and to enforce with spiritual sanctions. The social, civil, political problems connected with this great subject transcend our sphere, as God has not entrusted to His Church the organization of society, the construction of governments, nor the allotment of individuals to their various stations. The Church has as much right to preach to the monar-

chiefs of Europe and the despotism of Asia the doctrines of republican equality as to preach to the governments of the South the extirpation of slavery. This position is impregnable, unless it can be shown that slavery is a sin. Upon every other hypothesis, it is so clearly a question for the State that the proposition would never for a moment have been doubted, had there not been a foregone conclusion in relation to its moral character. Is slavery, then, a sin ?

(The concluding paragraphs of the Address contain no material bearing upon the question in hand.)

THE GARDINER SPRING RESOLUTION

Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God toward this favoured land, and also recognizing our obligations to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopt the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, the first day of July next be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds; and that on this day ministers and people are called on humbly to confess and bewail our national sins; to offer our thanks to the God of light for his abundant and undeserved goodness toward us as a nation; to seek his guidance and blessing upon our rulers, and their counsels, as well as on the Congress of the United States about to assemble; and to implore him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of an honourable peace.

Resolved, 2. That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligations to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States, and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage, the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution: and to this Constitution in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty.

And to avoid all misconception, the Assembly declare that by the terms "Federal Government," as here used, is not meant any particular administration, or the peculiar opinions of any particular party, but the central administration, which being at any time appointed and inaugurated according to the forms prescribed in the Constitution of the United States, is the visible representative of our national existence.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTION -- 1861

Gratefully acknowledging the distinguished bounty and care of Almighty God towards this favoured land, and also recognizing our obligation to submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, this General Assembly adopts the following resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That in view of the present agitated and unhappy condition of this country, Monday, the first day of July next, be hereby set apart as a day of prayer throughout our bounds, and that on that day ministers and people are called upon humbly to confess and bewail our national sins, to offer our thanks to the Father of lights for his abundant and undeserved goodness to us as a nation, to seek his guidance and blessings upon our rulers and their counsels, as well as upon the Congress then about to assemble, and to implore Him, in the name of Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of the Christian profession, to turn away his anger from us, and speedily restore to us the blessings of a safe and honourable peace.

Resolved, 2. That the members of this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare their obligation, so far as in them lies, to maintain the Constitution of these United States in the full exercise of all its legitimate powers, to preserve our beloved union unimpaired, and to restore its inestimable blessings to every portion of the land.

Resolved, 3. That in the present distracted state of the country, this Assembly, representing the whole Church, feel bound to abstain from any further declaration, in which all our ministers and members faithful to the Constitution and Standards of our Church, might not be able conscientiously and safely to join, and therefore, out of a regard as well to the interests of our beloved country, as to those of the Church, the Assembly adopts this Minute as its deliverance upon this subject.

THE HODGE PROTEST TO THE GARDINER SPRING RESOLUTION

We, the undersigned, respectfully protest against the action of the General Assembly, in adopting the minority report of the Committee on the State of the Country.

We make this protest, not because we do not acknowledge loyalty to our country to be a moral and religious duty, according to the word of God, which requires us to be subject to the powers that be; nor because we deny the right of the Assembly to enjoin that, and all other like duties, on the ministers and churches under its care; but because we deny the right of the General Assembly to decide the political question, to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians as citizens is due,

and its right to make that decision a condition of membership in our Church.

That the paper adopted by the Assembly does decide the political question just stated, is in our judgment undeniable. . It asserts not only the loyalty of this body to the Constitution and the Union, but it promises in the name of all the churches and ministers whom it represents, to do all that in them lies to "strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government." It is, however, a notorious fact, that many of our ministers and members conscientiously believe that the allegiance of the citizens of this country is primarily due to the States to which they respectively belong; and, therefore, that when any State renounces its connection with the United States, and its allegiance to the Constitution, the citizens of that State are bound by the laws of God to continue loyal to their State, and obedient to its laws. The paper adopted by the Assembly virtually declares, on the other hand, that the allegiance of the citizen is due to the United States; anything in the Constitution, or ordinances, or laws of the several States to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is not the loyalty of the members constituting this Assembly, nor of our Churches and ministers in any one portion of our country that is thus asserted, but the loyalty of the whole Presbyterian Church, North and South, East and West.

Allegiance to the Federal Government is recognized or declared to be the duty of all the churches and ministers represented in this body. In adopting this paper, therefore, the Assembly does decide the great political question which agitates and divides the country. The question is, whether the allegiance of our citizens is primarily to the State or to the Union. However clear our own convictions of the correctness of this decision may be, or however deeply we may be impressed with its importance, yet it is not a question which this Assembly has the right to decide.

A man may conscientiously believe that he owes allegiance to one government or another, and yet possess all the qualifications which the word of God or the Standards of the Church authorize us to demand in our members or ministers. As this General Assembly represents the whole Church, the acts and deliverances of this Assembly become the acts and deliverances of the Church. It is this consideration that gives to the action of this Assembly in this case all its importance, either in our own view or in the view of others.

It is the allegiance of the Old-school Presbyterian Church to the Constitution, the Union, and the Federal Government, which this paper is intended to profess and proclaim. It does, therefore, of necessity, decide the political question which agitates the country. It pronounces or assumes a particular interpretation of the Constitution. This is a matter clearly beyond the jurisdiction of the Assembly.

That the action of the Assembly in the premisses does not only decide the political question referred to, but makes that decision a term of membership in our Church, is no less clear. It is not analogous to the recommendation of a religious or benevolent institution, which our members may regard or not at pleasure; but it puts into the mouths of all represented in this body, a declaration of loyalty and allegiance to the Union and to the Federal Government. But such a declaration, made by our members residing in what are called the seceding States is treasonable. Presbyterians under the jurisdiction of those States, cannot, therefore, make that declaration. They are consequently forced to choose between allegiance to their States and allegiance to the Church.

The General Assembly in thus deciding a political question, and in making that decision practically a condition of membership to the Church, has, in our judgment, violated the Constitution of the Church, and usurped the prerogative of its Divine Master.

We protest loudly against the action of the Assembly, because it is a departure from all its previous actions.

The General Assembly has always acted on the principle that the Church has no right to make anything a condition of Christian or ministerial fellowship, which is not enjoined or required in the Scriptures and the Standards of the Church.

We have, at one time, resisted the popular demand to make total abstinence from intoxicating liquors a term of membership. At another time, the holding of slaves. In firmly resisting these unscriptural demands, we have preserved the integrity and unity of the Church, and it the great conservative body of truth, moderation, and liberty of conscience in our country. The Assembly have now descended from this high position, in making a political opinion a particular theory of the Constitution, however correct and important that theory may be, the condition of membership in our body, and thus, we fear, endangered the unity of the Church.

In the third place, we protest, because we regard the action of the Assembly as altogether unnecessary and uncalled for. It was required neither to instruct nor excite our brethren in the Northern States. It was not needed as a vindication of loyalty of the North.

Old-school Presbyterians everywhere out of the so-called seceding States, have openly avowed and conspicuously displayed their allegiance to the Constitution and the Government, and that in many cases at great cost and peril. Nor was such action required by our duty to the country. We are fully persuaded that we best promote the interests of the country by preserving the integrity and unity of the Church.

We regard this action of the Assembly, therefore, as a great national calamity, as well as the most disastrous to the interests of our Church which has marked its history.

We protest, fourthly, because we regard the action of the Assembly as unjust and cruel in its bearing on our Southern brethren. It was, in our judgment, unfair to entertain and decide such a momentous question when the great majority of our Southern Presbyteries were, from necessity, unrepresented in this body. And it is, in our judgment, a violation of the law of love to adopt an act which must expose the Southern churches that remain in connection with our Church, to suspicion, to loss of property, to personal danger, and which tends to destroy their usefulness in their appointed fields of labour.

And, finally, we protest, because we believe the act of the Assembly will not only diminish the resources of the Church, but greatly weaken its power for good, and expose it to the danger of being carried away more and more from its true principles by a worldly or fanatical spirit.

THE ANSWER TO THE HODGE PROTEST -- ASSEMBLY OF 1861 --

The action of the General Assembly, in reference to which these protests are offered, embraces two resolutions, against the former of which no objection is alleged. The whole stress of the protestation is directed upon the following sentence in the second resolution: "Resolved, That this General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin, and which has always characterized this Church, do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States; and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements, and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty."

The first and main ground of protest against the adoption of this resolution, is, that the General Assembly has no right to decide purely political questions; that the question whether the allegiance of the American Citizens is due primarily and eminently to the State, or to the Union, is purely political, of the gravest character, dependent upon constitutional theories and interpretations, respecting which various opinions prevail in different sections of our country; that the action of the Assembly virtually determines this vexed question, decides to which government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due, and makes that decision a term of communion.

That the action of the Assembly has political as well as moral bearings, is readily admitted. So had the decisions of our Divine Master, when he said to the Pharisees and Herodians, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's," Mark xlii 17; a decision still binding upon all men, and underlying this very act of the Assembly. The payment of

the required tax was both a moral and a political duty.

"There are occasions," says the author of an able article on "The State of the Country," in the January number of the Princeton Review, "there are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule of political action is to be sought, not in consideration of the State policy, but in the law of God When the question to be decided turns upon moral principles; when reason, conscience, and the religious sentiment are to be addressed, it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear, to endeavor to ally unholy feelings, and to bring truth to bear on the minds of their fellow-citizens." The General Assembly heartily approve these principles, and doubt not that if ever there were an occasion when political questions rose into the sphere of morals and religion, the present circumstances of our beloved country are of that character.

The protestants "deny the right of the General Assembly to decide to what government the allegiance of Presbyterians, as citizens, is due." Strictly speaking, the Assembly has made no such decision. They have said nothing respecting the allegiance of the subjects of any foreign power, or that of the members of our mission churches in India, China, or elsewhere, who may hold connection with our denomination. The action complained of relates solely to American Presbyterians, citizens of these United States.

Even with regard to them, the Assembly has not determined, as between conflicting governments, to which our allegiance is due. We are the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Such is the distinctive name, ecclesiastical and legal, under which we have chosen to be known by our sister churches and by the world. Our organization as a General Assembly was cotemporaneous with that of our Federal Government. In the seventy-four years of our existence, Presbyterians have known but one supreme government, one nationality, within our wide-spread territory. We know no other. History tells of none. The Federal Government acknowledges none. No nation on earth recognizes the existence of two independent sovereignties within these United States. What Divine Providence may intend for us hereafter--what curse of rival and hostile sovereignties within this broad heritage of our fathers, we presume not to determine. Do these protestants, who so anxiously avoid political entanglements, desire the General Assembly to anticipate the dread decision of impending battle, the action of our own government, the determination of foreign powers, and even the ultimate arbitration of Heaven? Would they have us recognize, as good Presbyterians, men whom our own government, with the approval of Christendom, may soon execute as traitors?

May not the highest court of our Church, speaking as the interpreter of that holy law which says, "Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience's sake," Rom xlii 5. In the language of the learned Reviewer above cited, "Is disunion morally right? Does it not involve a breach of faith, and a violation of the oaths by which that faith was confirmed? We believe, under existing circumstances, that it does, and therefore it is as dreadful a blow to the Church as it is to the State. If a crime at all, it is one the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated."

In the judgment of this Assembly, "this saying is true," and therefore the admission, on the part of the Assembly, that Presbyterians may take up arms against the Federal Government, or aid and comfort its enemies, and yet be guiltless, would exhibit that "practical recognition of secession," which, says the Reviewer, "would destroy our national life."

But we deny that this deliverance of the Assembly establishes any new term of communion. The terms of Christian fellowship are laid down in the word of God, and are embodied in our standards. It is competent to this Court to interpret and apply the doctrines of the Word; to warn men against prevailing sins; and to urge the performance of neglected duties. We regard the action, against which these protests are levelled, simply as a faithful declaration, by the Assembly, of Christian duty toward those in authority over us; which adds nothing to the terms of communion already recognized. Surely the idea of the obligation of loyalty to our Federal Government is no new thing to Presbyterians.

And this is a sufficient reply, also, to the second article of this protest. Having established no new term of membership, this Assembly is not liable to the charge of having departed from the old paths.

A third ground of the protest is the allegation that this action of the Assembly is uncalled for, and unnecessary. Yet, on the admission of these protestants themselves, it is a "notorious fact," that many of our ministers and members believe themselves absolved from all obligations of loyalty to our National Government--believe, in contradiction to the Princeton Reviewer, that disunion is morally right; and some, are already in arms to vindicate these opinions. What, when "a crime, the heinousness of which can only be imperfectly estimated"-- "striking as dreadful a blow at the Church as at the State," is already committed; when thousands of Presbyterians are likely to be seduced from their allegiance by the machinations of wicked men; when our national prosperity is overclouded; when every material interest is in jeopardy, and every spiritual energy paralyzed; when armed rebellion joins issue with armed authority

on battle-fields, when tens of thousands must perish; when it remains a question, whether our national life survives the conflict, or whether our sun sets in anarchy and blood--is it uncalled for, unnecessary, for this Christian Assembly to renew, in the memories and hearts of a Christian people, respect for the majesty of the law, and a sense of the obligation of loyalty? Let posterity decide between us.

That this decision of the Assembly is unjust to a portion of our Church, not now fully represented in this body, is a fourth reason of protest. We need only reply, that the roll of this Assembly shows delegates from Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas. All might have been as easily represented. Besides, this action has no local or sectional character. The subject is one of national relations, as well as of such pressing urgency, that to have waited for a full Southern representation, in a future Assembly, would have been to lose forever the critical moment when action might be productive of good.

As to the final ground of protest, it is enough to record our simple denial of the opinions expressed. We sincerely believe that this action of the General Assembly will increase the power of the Church for good; securing, as we humbly trust it will, the favor of her exalted Head, in behalf of those who testify for a suffering truth.